

DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Western Europe

Vol VII No 075

18 April 1986

EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Attack on Libya Reveals 'Weakness' of EEC Ties	B 1
EEC Ministers Hold 'Emergency' Meeting 17 Apr	B 1
'Refrain' From Statement [Paris]	B 2
'Tougher' Measures Urged	B 3
Howe Gives Evidence on Libya	B 4
Howe: Close People's Bureaus	B 5
Turkish, Netherlands Envoys View EEC Relations [Ankara]	B 5
European Parliament Condemns U.S. Raid on Libya	B 6

NATO

Spanish Envoy Criticizes U.S. on Libya Intervention [Madrid]	C 1
Carrington Says 'Not Consulted' on U.S. Attack [Madrid]	C 1

AUSTRIA

Vienna, Rome Airports Get Anonymous Bomb Threats	E 1
ICU Chairman Mock Comments on U.S. Air Raid	E 1
Waldheim on Ignorance of Deportation Moves	E 1
Waldheim Hires Lawyer To Deal With 'Slander'	E 1

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Kohl, France's Chirac Meet in Bonn 17 April	J 1
Reaffirm 'Close' Relations	J 1
Discuss Ties, U.S.-Libya Clash	J 2
Pro-Libyan Slogans Accompany Warehouse Fire	J 2
Genscher Asks Warsaw Pact To Help Fight Terror	J 2
Press Reviews U.S. Strike Against Libya	J 2
Bangeman Briefs Bundestag on SDI Agreement	J 4
Kohl: Bundestag Stance on SDI 'Hypocritical'	J 8
SPD's Ehmke Opposes FRG Involvement in SDI	J 13
Woerner Rejects SPD 'Accusation' on SDI Role	J 14
Romania's Vaduva Arrives, Meets With Bangemann	J 14
ROK President Chon Tu-hwan Arrives in Bonn	J 14

FRANCE

Majority's 'Serious Difficulties' Over U.S. Attack	K 1
Return to 'Gaullist Tradition'	K 1
Political Parties React to Libya Developments [LE MONDE 17 Apr]	K 1
LE FIGARO Reviews Libya Attack Arguments [16 Apr]	K 2
LE MATIN on "Predictable" U.S.-Libya Clash [16 Apr]	K 4
Libyans Face Expulsion; No Reasons Offered	K 4
Libya Charges 'Disinformation'	K 5

Chirac, Tunisia's Mzali Discuss Raid on Libya	K 5
Chirac Optimistic About German Relations	K 5
Mitterrand, Japan's Abe Preview Tokyo Summit [KYODO]	K 5
Police Round Up Action Direct Suspects, Money	K 6

ITALY

Foreign Ministry Protests Attack on Lampedusa	L -1
Political, Military State of Alert	L 2
Lampedusa Unable To Detect Libyan 'Scud' Missiles	L 2
Spadolini Rejects Criticism of Lampedusa Defense	L 2
Report to Defense Committee	L 2
LA STAMPA Interview	L 2
Measures Considered in Wake of Lampedusa Attack	L 3
No Italians Hurt, No Interests Damaged in Tripoli	L 3
Libya Contacted on Safety, Return of Nationals	L 3
UK, Austria Ask Aid	L 3
No Multinational Evacuation Plan	L 4
First Flight From Libya Since Raid Arrives	L 4
Alitalia Cancels Libya Links	L 4
Bishop 'Under House Arrest in Benghazi'	L 4

PORTUGAL

Cavaco Silva Back From FRG, Discusses Libya	M 1
Support for EEC Stand	M 1
Remarks on Libya; Tripoli Envoy	M 1
Demonstrators Protest at U.S. Embassy Over Raid	M 2

SPAIN

Political Parties React to U.S. Raid on Libya	N 1
Demonstrations Protest U.S. Attack on Libya	N 1
At U.S. Embassy, Consulate	N 1
At U.S. Military Bases	N 2
500 Demonstrate in Zaragoza	N 2
Further on Mass Protests	N 2
Protests Continue for 3d Day	N 3
Iberia, Lufthansa Cancel Tripoli Flights	N 3
Spanish TU Asks Cancellation of Shipping to Libya	N 3

NORDIC AFFAIRS

Leaders, Papers React to Attack on Libya	P 1
--	-----

SWEDEN

Carlsson Sees 'Promising Sign' in Soviet View	P 2
Paper Prefers Libya Boycott to Military Action	P 2
[SVENSKA DAGBLADET 15 Apr]	

UNITED KINGDOM

'Stormy Exchanges' in Parliament on Al-Qadhdhafi	Q 1
Kinnock Blames Thatcher for Deaths of Hostages	Q 1
Opposition Spokesman: U.S. Attacks 'Irrational'	Q 1

Paper Seeks 'Illumination' on Future Use of Bases [DAILY TELEGRAPH 17 Apr]	Q 2
Antiterrorist Branch Names Bomb Suspect	Q 3
Workers in Libya Safe, Keep 'Low Profile' [DAILY TELEGRAPH 16 Apr]	Q 3
Howe Condemns Murder of Hostages in Beirut	Q 3
USSR's Karpov in London for Disarmament Talks	Q 4

CYPRUS

UK Bases on Alert; Possible Evacuation Seen [O FILELEVTHEROS 18 Apr]	R 1
Arab Missions Issue Warning Over UK Bases [I SIMERINI 17 Apr]	R 1
Daily Questions Effect of U.S. Action in Libya [O FILELEVTHEROS 17 Apr]	R 1
CSSR Ambassador Discusses Bilateral Relations [O FILELEVTHEROS 16 Apr]	R 2
Kiprianou Returns From Consultations in Greece	R 3
Turkish Cypriot Parties Condemn U.S. Operation [Bayrak Radio]	R 3
Further Report [Bayrak Radio]	R 4

GREECE

GREEK Forces on Alert Near U.S. Military Bases [ATHENS NEWS 17 Apr]	S 1
Libyan Official Brings Message From Al-Qadhdhafi	S 1
Libyan Envoy on U.S. Raid, Europe's Role [RIZOSPASTIS 17 Apr]	S 1
Kiprianou, Papandreou View Cyprus Issues [Nicosia I SIMERINI 16 Apr]	S 3

TURKEY

Yilmaz Urges Cooperation Against Terrorism	T 1
SDP Chief on Government Approach to Libyan Crisis	T 1
Security Precautions Taken at U.S. Bases	T 1
Evren's Stance on U.S.-Turkish Ties Questioned [Our Radio]	T 1

ATTACK ON LIBYA REVEALS 'WEAKNESS' OF EEC TIES

AU161756 Paris AFP in English 1622 GMT 16 Apr 86

[Text] Brussels, April 16 (AFP) -- The U.S. attack against Libya has exposed the weakness of the political ties binding the 12 European Economic Community (EEC) nations, and put in jeopardy the EEC's relations with the Arab world, EEC and diplomatic sources said here on Wednesday. Tensions resulting from the raids would be evident when the EEC foreign ministers meet in Paris on Thursday, the sources said.

Some ministers will recall that at their emergency meeting on the U.S.-Libyan crisis, held in The Hague on Monday, a few colleagues probably were aware that an attack on Libya was imminent, but failed to inform them. British Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe clearly seemed to be among the latter because, as the EEC ministers called for U.S. restraint and political and diplomatic sanctions against Libya, Britain apparently had already agreed to let U.S. planes fly off from U.S. air bases in Britain to launch the raids. But the Spanish and French foreign ministers apparently also knew the die were cast on the attack because their governments had refused to let the U.S. planes overfly France and Spain en route towards Libyan targets. Furthermore, the sources said, some EEC members -- including Belgium, West German, Luxembourg and the Netherlands -- fear that their emergency meeting on Monday may be interpreted as a show. The meeting ended only hours before U.S. planes bombed targets in Tripoli and Benghazi.

Several EEC foreign ministers have expressed displeasure at not having been alerted that the attack was imminent while they were holding their emergency meeting. Belgian Foreign Minister Leo Tindemans has called Britain's stand at The Hague "double-dealing", and the Dutch press on Wednesday was very critical of what it dubbed as Britain's ambiguous role at the meeting. But the British Embassy in Brussels has said that Washington decided to attack while the meeting at The Hague was going on and that Sir Geoffrey had learned about it when he arrived back in London.

Sources close to West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher said he would not have flown off to Washington to stress restraint after the meeting at The Hague if he had been informed that the attack already had been decided. West Germany has joined Britain as the only European countries to back the U.S. action, however.

Foreign Minister Jacques Poos of Luxembourg said on Tuesday that the EEC as such was not "alerted that the attack was imminent nor consulted by the American Government." Mr. Tindemans echoed this hardly veiled criticism of U.S. attitudes towards its European partners by saying that Europe's attitude counted "very little" in Washington's decisions.

EEC MINISTERS HOLD 'EMERGENCY' MEETING 17 APRIL

AU170840 Paris AFP in English 0835 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Excerpts] Paris, April 17 (AFP) -- Foreign ministers of the 12-nation European Community (EEC) ended an emergency meeting here Thursday "convinced" there should be no further military action in the conflict between Libya and the United States. The ministers said: "In order to achieve a political solution everything must be done to avoid a new military action."

Dutch Foreign Minister Hans den ven Broek, current chairman of the E.E.C. Council of Ministers, said after the one and a half [as received] meeting -- slotted in before on OECD ministerial meeting here -- the ministers had also agreed to speed up measures already decided on, to combat terrorism.

At a meeting on Monday in The Hague, the ministers had decided to reduce the size of Libyan diplomatic missions in member countries and tighten visa and other controls in Libyan nationals entering the EEC. The foreign ministers gathered here before attending the scheduled spring meeting of the 24 members OECD at which finance ministers were also to be present. The gathering is to decide on ways to stimulate the world economy.

Mr. Van den Broek said the EEC foreign ministers sought: "forcefully to address the problem of international terrorism" and had reiterated their view that "state supported terrorism is unacceptable." He said they would "try to de-escalate the situation but want to take concrete measures in combatting terrorism. They have decided to intensify their diplomatic action towards the Arab nations, the Arab League, the United States, the Soviet Union, eastern European countries and the chairmanship of the Nonaligned Movement."

French Foreign Minister Jean-Bernard Raimond said the atmosphere at the meeting had been "coolheaded". He said it was marked by a "a sense of responsibility, moderation and the desire for European unity." Ministers played down the threats against Britain made after the U.S. attack which used bombers based in Britain. Mr. Raimond said: "We hope Col. al-Qadhafi will have a sense of his responsibilities before the world." He reiterated the ministers had already decided to take "appropriate action" if Col. al-Qadhafi carried out his threats against Britain or other member countries.

In Brussels the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) announced that U.S. Assistant Secretary of State John Whitehead was expected there Thursday to brief the 16 members of the alliance on the U.S. raid against Libya. Mr. Whitehead had stopped over in Paris to discuss the affair with EEC foreign ministers.

Earlier EEC sources had predicted a stormy gathering because of Britain's clearly divergent position on the raid. There were suspicions that British Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe had known of the attack but said nothing to his colleagues. In the event any disagreement appeared to have been settled and no signs of a split came out of Tuesday's gathering.

'Refrain' From Statement

LD170826 Paris International Service in French 0800 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Excerpts] The 12 foreign affairs ministers of the EEC are to meet in Paris today to try to agree on the attitude to be adopted on the U.S.-Libyan conflict, while taking into account, of course, the fact that Bonn and London are supporting Ronald Reagan. I have just this minute learned that the EEC foreign ministers have decided to refrain from publishing a new statement on Libya. They are restricting themselves to reaffirming the need to show moderation in the Mediterranean. They have also decided to step up their diplomatic efforts to put an end to terrorism in the region. They also announce that they will discuss the question in detail during their next meeting in Luxembourg on 21 April.

'Tougher' Measures Urged

LD170926 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 0842 GMT 17 Apr 86

[By Geoff Meade, PA staff reporter in Paris]

[Text] Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe convinced the rest of the Common Market today that when he attended the EEC foreign ministers' meeting last Monday he knew nothing of America's decision to launch an air strike against Libya.

After a brief meeting of the foreign ministers in Paris early today the current EEC President Hans Van den Broek announced that everyone was satisfied that they had not been kept in the dark by Sir Geoffrey. The foreign secretary left the talks to return to London for a cabinet meeting, leaving it to Mr Van den Broek to announce the healing of the apparent rift between Britain and her community partners. Mr van den Broek said he wanted to clear the air about European credibility following Monday's meeting at The Hague when EEC ministers called for restraint. Shortly afterwards American fighter planes took off from U.S. airbases in Britain to launch their attack. "It has been established that at the time that we met in The Hague no definite decision about military action was known to any of the participants of our meeting," declared Mr van den Broek. But he added that this did not mean there was no knowledge about possible preparation for military action.

Mr van den Broek said he was concerned that the sincerity of the European approach would be in doubt if anyone felt that the EEC's appeal on Monday to avoid military escalation had been issued "against a background of contrary information". In fact, Sir Geoffrey Howe was in telephone contact with his fellow foreign ministers immediately after returning to London on Monday night to learn that the attack was under way.

Today, however, he was still the strongest advocate of a harder line against the Al-Qadhafi regime from Europe. He told his colleagues they needed to take tougher measures than those agreed on Monday, and once again called on them to follow Britain's lead by shutting down any branches of the Libyan People's Bureau - Libya's "embassies" throughout the community. The foreign ministers are to meet again in Luxembourg on Monday to consider a report now being drawn up which will give details of proposed action against international terrorism.

Meanwhile, Mr van den Broek said that the ministers had reiterated at today's meeting the need for all sides to "show the utmost restraint". He said it had been agreed that implementing the package of anti-terrorism measures agreed on Monday should be accelerated. Specifically aimed at Libya, these include tighter controls on the movement of Libyan diplomats, officials and civilians. "We cannot take the phenomena of international terrorism seriously enough, and more specifically state-supported terrorism which is absolutely unacceptable."

One outcome of today's meeting, went on Mr van den Broek, was the start of international diplomatic links by the EEC countries in a bid to crack down on terrorist groups. Approaches are to be made to the Arab League, the Soviet Union and Eastern block countries, as well as traditional allies, such as the USA. Mr van den Broek said that one of the prime endeavours now was to defuse the situation in the Mediterranean, and that could only be done by concerted international effort.

Howe Gives Evidence on Libya

LD171016 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 0949 GMT 17 Apr 86

[By Geoff Meada, PA staff reporter in Paris]

[Text] Britain's "indisputable evidence" of Libya's state-sponsored terrorism is being sent to other Common Market governments today.

Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe promised EEC foreign ministers at talks at Paris that he would provide fullest details by letter, particularly of links between the Libyan regime and the provisional IRA, proof of a Libyan connection with the recent bombing in Berlin, and the background to the murder in London in 1984 of policewoman Yvonne Fletcher.

Sir Geoffrey hopes such evidence will persuade the rest of the EEC to take far tougher action to crack down on the Al-Qadhafi regime.

The foreign secretary told other community governments at today's meeting that it was not surprising if Americans was frustrated with the Common Market's weak support for its stand over terrorism.

He hinted that stronger EEC backing for the U.S. sooner could have helped head off the kind of military confrontation which was finally launched by President Reagan on Monday. "It is up to the Community to find a credible alternative to the military option," said Sir Geoffrey. He insisted once again that the closure of the Libyan People's Bureaux -- Libya's "embassies" -- around Europe would be one of the most effective ways of hitting against state-sponsored terrorism.

Only the Greeks raised the question of how much Sir Geoffrey knew in advance of President Reagan's intention at the time of the last EEC emergency meeting on Monday. The foreign secretary's insistence that he had no confirmation whatsoever on an air strike was immediately accepted a clear sign of the priority now given to maintaining a unified alliance in the present circumstances.

EEC foreign ministers next meet in Luxembourg next Monday, when they will consider a detailed report from a special committee of EEC government officials.

They were called together on January 27 to begin work in the wake of EEC talks which at that time rejected Washington's appeals for strong European support over Libya.

Their report includes a detailed analysis of state-backed terrorism, and sets out a range of options to be taken by the common market. It does not rule out economic sanctions although these have already been rejected by Britain as ineffective and unworkable.

The strongest advocates of tough action -- Britain, Ireland, and Holland -- will be looking for a swift decision on Monday to introduce a package of measures providing positive support for Washington.

With the help of the evidence being provided today by Britain, Sir Geoffrey hopes the EEC will belatedly take a tough stand against Col al-Qadhafi and state-sponsored terrorism wherever it emerges.

Howe: Close People's Bureaus

LD171926 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1750 GMT 17 Apr 86

[By Geoff Meade, PA staff Reporter in Paris]

[Text] Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe tonight spoke of the tragic price which may have to be paid as part of Britain's fight against international terrorism in the wake of the murder of three Britons in Beirut. He warned that the government would not be diverted by reprisal attacks. Speaking in Paris, Sir Geoffrey said: "I totally and fully understand the anguish of those families whose members are caught up in the horrors of terrorism. But if we are to prevent others from having that experience we must not concede victory to the terrorist. That is one of the problems in a democracy -- taking the necessary action to tackle terrorism. If we give way to the arguments about loss of life then we give in to the terrorists."

Calling for tougher action by the EEC against Libya, Sir Geoffrey said he would be pressing for the closure of all Libyan People's Bureaux in Europe. "These offices are in effect command posts of Libyan terrorism and if we close them we have a chance of succeeding," he said.

Sir Geoffrey expressed deepest sympathy for the families of the three British victims but said the loss of innocent lives was one of the "tragic victims but said the loss of innocent lives was one of the "tragic consequences" of state-sponsored terrorism. To be put off by such actions would be to grant a charter for the indefinite, unrestrained continuation of terrorism. Society would be deprived of the right ever to take action if it was diverted by such reprisals -- and that was the precise effect terrorists sought to achieve. He said the UK had already successfully overcome terrorist campaigns in other parts of the world by "patient determination", and he pledged himself to achieve the same against Libya.

The total closure of all Libyan Peoples Bureaux in Europe was one of the key elements in a concerted and effective joint campaign which must now be launched by the EEC governments. "I want them closed completely and that is what I will be seeking on Monday," said Sir Geoffrey, referring to fresh talks next week between EEC foreign ministers in Luxembourg. He said EEC member states must back Britain's lead by taking tougher measures against Libya than they had so far been prepared to do.

"The credibility of the community has not come well out of its inability so far to take collective action. But I am heartened that now we are beginning to mobilise an effective response."

TURKISH, NETHERLANDS ENVOYS VIEW EEC RELATIONS

TA171733 Ankara Domestic Service in Turkish 1600 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Excerpt] While the OECD meeting was going on in Paris, Foreign Minister Vahit Halefoglu held a meeting with Hans van den Broek, the Netherlands minister of foreign affairs. Replying to a question on the meeting by a Turkish radio and television correspondent, Halefoglu said that they exchanged views on international terrorism and Turkish-EEC relations. He said that he explained to Hans van den Broek that Turkey believes in international cooperation for the prevention of terrorism and in peaceful means for the solution of bilateral problems. Halefoglu said: I told the minister that the operation against Libya is incompatible with international law.

Halefoglu said that Hans van den Broek discussed the EEC foreign ministers meeting and exchanged views with him on problems between Turkey and the EEC. Halefoglu recalled that even though Turkey unilaterally lifted the visa requirement on Greek citizens, thus displaying its goodwill, Greece continues to create problems at international meetings. He added: It is not we, but the Greeks, who create the difficulties and the problems. I explained all this to Mr Hans van den Broek.

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT CONDEMNS U.S. RAID ON LIBYA

AU171921 Paris AFP in English 1915 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] Strasbourg, France, April 17 (AFP) -- The European Parliament here Thursday condemned the U.S. raid on Libya, saying it was "deeply incensed" at what it termed a "flagrant violation of international law." In a resolution passed by a slim, 148-to-144-vote margin, the Parliament said Tuesday's raid was "a dangerous escalation of the use of force (and) an inappropriate and unsuitable means of stemming the tide of terrorism and punishing the guilty parties."

The resolution also condemned Libyan aggressions against Europe and, in particular, the failed missile attack on a U.S. base on Lampedusa, Italy. The European Parliament "condemns the military attack by Libya on European territory and the terrorists and military threats made by Libya against European states," the resolution said.

It criticized Britain for allowing U.S. warplanes based on its territory to conduct the raid, but noted that Britain had endorsed the European Economic Community demand that "priority be given to a political solution".

The resolution was passed by communist, socialist, ecologist and pacifist votes, over a conservative draft "acknowledging the right of self-defence... against terrorism" and accusing Mu'ammarr al-Qadhafi of placing Libya "outside the rules of law recognized by the nations of the world."

The conservative text was rejected by 158 votes to 153, with three abstentions.

CARRINGTON SAYS 'NOT CONSULTED' ON U.S. ATTACK

Ld171854 Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish 1700 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington says in an exclusive interview to Madrid radio that the U.S. attack on Libya had nothing to do with the Atlantic alliance and that he was not consulted on the military operation.

SPANISH ENVOY CRITICIZES U.S ON LIBYA

LD161955 Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish 1900 GMT 16 Apr 86

[Excerpt] At a NATO meeting in Brussels the Spanish ambassador was the only one to criticize in energetic terms the U.S. intervention in Libya. According to diplomatic sources, the other ambassadors expressed their concern at the events.

VIENNA, ROME AIRPORTS GET ANONYMOUS BOMB THREATS

AU171742 Vienna ORF Teletext in German 1641 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] Vienna/Rome -- Two anonymous bomb threats stirred up commotion at the Vienna and Rome-Ciampino Airports today. Anonymous callers claimed that a bomb had been planted in a Fokker-28 of the "Unifly" company with 40 passengers on board. Following a thorough search in Vienna, the plane landed safely in Rome. Even the search after landing has not yet produced any results. [Vienna Domestic Service in German at 1620 GMT on 17 April reports on this incident, adding that it involved a "charter flight with 40 American passengers on board"]

ICU CHAIRMAN MOCK COMMENTS ON U.S. AIR RAID

AU152041 Vienna Television Service in German 1740 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Text] Austrian People's Party Chairman Alois Mock said, also in his capacity as chief of ICU, the international union of Christian and conservative parties, that it is still impossible to pass final judgment on the U.S. operation. There are neither proofs of the U.S. suspicion that Libya is responsible for the recent terrorist attacks against U.S. citizens, nor is the exact scope of the American retaliatory strike against Libya known. As a matter of principle, however, violence as a political means must be condemned in the same way as terrorism.

WALDHEIM ON IGNORANCE OF DEPORTATION MOVES

AU171932 Vienna Television Service in German 1745 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] Speaking at a press conference in Eisenstadt today, presidential candidate Kurt Waldheim gave a new explanation for his knowing nothing about the deportation of Jews from Salonika in 1943. His previous explanation -- that he had been stationed outside Salonika and therefore had not noticed anything -- has been questioned, among others by Simon Weisenthal. Waldheim said today that he looked into the matter and found out that at the time of the transport of Jews in the spring and summer of 1943 he had not been in Salonika at all -- he had been in Tirana, in what is today Albania, and thereafter in Athens.

WALDHEIM HIRES LAWYER TO DEAL WITH 'SLANDER'

AU181214 Vienna ORF Teletext in German 1410 GMT 18 Apr 86

[Text] Vienna -- Presidential candidate Kurt Waldheim has commissioned a Vienna lawyer to deal with the "slander campaign waged against him." The Viennese lawyer, Theo Petter, will therefore consider appropriate legal steps against several persons not further specified by Waldheim. Waldheim said that he does not intend "to deal with new defilements day after day" and wants to dedicate himself exclusively to material problems during the remaining election campaign.

KOHL, FRANCE'S CHIRAC MEET IN BONN 17 APRIL

Reaffirm 'Close' Relations

LD171913 Hamburg DPA in German 1446 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] Bonn, 17 Apr (DPA) -- The Federal Republic and France intend to shape German-French relations in a close and friendly manner even after the change of government in Paris. Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl and French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac affirmed this to journalists in Bonn after a 3-hour exchange of opinions on international and bilateral questions including the East-West situation, the Libya crisis, and EC problems. Chirac explained that he views his first visit to the Federal Republic as a special gesture. The result of his conversation with Kohl is that both governments are geared toward "agreement and entente." Kohl announced that all topics discussed should be "implemented in the near future." "I am certain that there will be good cooperation." The chancellor and the prime minister agreed to meet officially and unofficially as often as possible.

Horst Teltschik, the chancellor's foreign policy spokesman, judged the most important result of the conversation between Kohl and Chirac to be the approval of the cooperation arranged with the old socialist government in the security policy field by the new Paris head of government. Teltschik said: "We assume that this government fully shares the security policy." At the last German-French consultations at the end of February, both sides initiated close cooperation, which includes consultations on the implementation of French nuclear weapons in the [words indistinct], maneuvers by the two armies and a joint officers' training program. In agricultural policy and in the technology sector, experts are now to speak after taking stock of the implementation of joint projects which have already come up for discussion. Teltschik said that it has become discernible that the Chirac government, compared with its predecessor, wishes to mark out its own areas of emphasis. It could be that an improvement in cooperation over many questions would ensue; however, complications are not be ruled out either. Among the technology projects he named the Ariane spacecraft, the Hermes space vehicle, and the development of the Airbus series.

As well as questions of technology and agriculture, over which both sides stated their willingness to agree, Kohl said that the Libyan problem was also addressed. According to Teltschik, there were no differences in the analysis of this situation, but apparently there are different positions on possible paths of action. France's special role in the African states was brought up in this connection. With regard to the attitude toward the U.S. SDI plan for a missile defense system in space, Bonn believes it can discern an attitude different from Francois Mitterrand's based on Chirac's election campaign pronouncements.

Chirac is to meet with Franz Josef Strauss, the Bavarian prime minister and chairman of the Airbus supervisory council, in Paris on Wednesday. Kohl and Mitterrand are scheduled to meet on Thursday in Trier in order to discuss agricultural policy and the forthcoming world economic summit in Tokyo. Before Chirac's visit to Bonn, Paris described the meeting as a symbol of the significance of the "German-French axis" in Europe. To the question as to who would be the main interlocutor with Bonn, Mitterrand or Chirac, the government spokesman answered "La France" and referred to the good cooperation of both politicians in foreign policy.

The Foreign Ministry announced after a meeting between Chirac and Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher that both countries "took the same line on the measures which must now be tackled."

Genscher reported to the French prime minister that in Paris in May he will be planning with Foreign Minister Jean Bernard Raimond, and leading officials of both foreign ministries the first exchange of personnel in the history of the German and French foreign ministries.

Discuss Ties, U.S.-Libya Clash

AU171736 Paris AFP in English 1718 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] Bonn, April 17 (AFP) -- West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl and French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac held three-hours of talks here Thursday that focused on economic and technological cooperation. Mr. Chirac, speaking later, said the French Government's new economic strategy should make possible "new grounds for understanding and possibly easier cooperation." Analysts said the new French Government's plans to liberalize exchange control and capital movement had long been advocated by West Germany.

The two leaders also discussed Franco-German technological cooperation, notably in such ventures as the Airbus Industrie consortium, the Ariane space rocket and the construction of combat helicopters.

Mr Kohl's spokesman said the meeting also touched on recent events in Libya, with both agreeing in their analysis of the U.S.-Libyan clash.

Today's meeting came one week before Mr. Kohl is due to meet Mr. Mitterrand here.

PRO-LIBYAN SLOGANS ACCOMPANY WAREHOUSE FIRE

LD171743 Hamburg DPA in German 1627 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] Duesseldorf, 17 Apr (DPA) -- An incendiary attack was made today on a customer-served warehouse of the Telefunken company. The fire, which according to police was started out of "indisputably political motives," caused damages totaling DM100,000. The police said that pro-Libyan slogans were sprayed on the outer wall of the building. The damage resulted from smoke generated by a smouldering fire. No was was injured.

GENSCHER ASKS WARSAW PACT TO HELP FIGHT TERROR

DW180727 Hamburg ARD Television in German 2050 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] Foreign Minister Genscher, in a talk with his Romania counterpart Vaduva, has called on the Arab countries and the Warsaw Pact member-states to help combat international terrorism. He said that countries that are still indifferent should be urged to respect international law.

PRESS REVIEWS U.S. STRIKE AGAINST LIBYA

DW171229 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 0505 GMT 17 Apr 86

[From the press review]

[Text] Editorial writers today deal in particular with reactions to the U.S. action against Libya and also discuss the Bundestag debate yesterday on that topic.

We read in WESTDEUTSCHE ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG, Essen: The United States has taught the Europeans a lesson: In case of emergency it considers it more important to coordinate its policy with the Soviets, so as not to risk a conflict, than to take the Europeans into their confidence if their view differs from the U.S. position. So the Europeans have once again been shown who really holds power. If they want to complain, then they should complain about the fact that they are political midgets and that between the two superpowers they are by no means the third political force of equal rank, of which they dream every night.

SCHWAEBISCHE ZEITUNG of Leutkirch views the situation as follows: The United States acted without asking the Europeans. It informed its international political opponent, the Soviet Union, faster and better than its own allies. Such treatment hurts. A politician like Kohl must feel particularly hurt because he had probably expected more sincerity of Ronald Reagan. If the Europeans complain, they should primarily complain about their inactivity. Why should a U.S. President consult his partners before acting? Especially partners who do not want to have anything to do with the matter and who he knows will only try to dissuade him or mess up his plans? He addressed those whose help he needed. France refused to help; America's old ally Great Britain helped. During his term of office Henry Kissinger was annoyed at the fact that the Europeans did not accept any commitments outside their continent, but wanted to prevent the Americans from acting at all.

FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE writes: Many domestic policy experts in Bonn find it difficult to realize that there are differences regarding a country's importance in the world and in the Western alliance. The United States has shown who is the partner that counts because it can act. Federal Foreign Minister Genscher under these circumstances only made a meek appearance in Washington and had to admit that he could not even speak on behalf of all the countries of the Old World. It is useless for FDP deputies to complain about the Balkanization of Europe and about the fact that each European state has a different relationship to the United States. Kohl did not complain about Washington, because he would thereby only have made himself small. With his government statement to the Bundestag the chancellor was trying to relieve the Germans of fear that has been caused by various nervous statements. He was trying to perform a balancing act which was intended to demonstrate understanding for the Americans' rage at Libyan-controlled terrorism, which was, however, not intended to mean approval of every action by Washington.

WESTFAELISCHE NACHRICHTEN of Muenster states: How very true. Kohl said yesterday that international terrorism cannot be fought with mere complaints and persuasive language. Then how can it be fought? With friendly representations to Mr al-Qadhafi? By taking a wait-and-see attitude until the specter of terror and its helpers eventually disappear automatically from the scene of action? The course of using force that the United States embarked on with its bombing raid on Tripoli and Benghazi is not acceptable for most Europeans, including the Bonn government. According to Kohl's statement, the German side would not have chosen the means that the Americans finally resorted to. One day after the dramatic events in the Mediterranean, the schizophrenia of Bonn's attitude became quite clear here. Wash my hands, but do not make me wet, the chancellor cries and does not want to agree to the plain fact that those who are affected are finally defending themselves from Colonel al-Qadhafi's violence. The opposition continues to state that the end does not justify every means. However, Hans-Jochen Vogel also does not say what means could then be applied.

BANGEMANN BRIEF'S BUNDESTAG ON SDI AGREEMENT

DW170901 Cologne Westdeutscher Rundfunk Network in German 0701 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Speech by Economics Minister Martin Bangemann to Bundestag -- live]

[Text] Mr President, esteemed ladies and gentlemen: In the spring of 1985, the Federal chancellor and the Federal Government commented extensively on the SDI research program. You can look up those statements in the bulletin. The Federal Government stands by them. They were considered and confirmed in the cabinet decision of 18 December 1985. That decision is also known. The discussion about SDI research work must take place on a businesslike basis and not on the basis of speculation. Pursuant to the 27 March and 18 April 1985 statements, the Federal cabinet gave me a clear mission. On that basis negotiations took place between January and March 1986. On 27 March 1986 I signed two agreements on technological exchange and research participation in SDI. My mission was to improve framework conditions for technological cooperation between partners in the United States and German firms and to facilitate fair conditions for the participation of German firms and research institutes in research projects within the SDI research framework.

The agreements I signed fulfill that mission. I have informed the respective Bundestag committees -- to the extent required and as far as possible considering the time constraints -- about details of the agreements.

I want to point out particularly that with the common basic agreement, a mutual exchange of scientific research results and cooperation of science and the economy in research, production, and marketing is to be promoted. Those goals, which were set for me by the cabinet in its decision on the negotiations, have been fully accepted by the U.S. Government and integrated into the common basic agreement.

In this connection we have underscored a number of principles that have been reduced to bilateral or multilateral treaties, which we believe will be useful in future cooperation in technologically ambitious fields. As the basis for cooperation, the general agreement expressly mentions the principle of most-favored-nation treatment, free competition, and nondiscrimination.

It has been agreed that both sides will work to limit the administrative problems connected with our respective foreign trade laws. In addition, we have agreed on a consultation mechanism that also can be used to solve conflicts. These agreed-upon consultation mechanisms afford us the opportunity to develop further the agreement through gradually solving problems as we go along. We want to further facilitate daily cooperation of German firms with U.S. partners, and to assist such cooperation where it seems necessary and useful to those involved.

Past experience has shown that the complexity and confusion of laws and administrative procedures demand a consultation mechanism that works rapidly and efficiently. We have now created that mechanism. The general basic agreement does not -- and I stress this expressly because it was the subject of discussion -- envisage additional restrictions going beyond export limitations valid in the FRG.

The Federal Government maintains that the foreign trade law, with its regulations, is the place where stipulations should be made that are necessary in the alliance's common security interest. That will remain as it is. [applause]

The Federal Government will not stipulate foreign trade controls outside that legal framework.

The second agreement pertains to the participation by German companies and research institutes in the SDI research program. In this context it is particularly important to make it clear what the agreement is, what it contains, and what it is not, what it does not contain. The agreement on participation by German companies and research institutes in SDI research essentially governs the relationship between the ordering agencies in the United States and contractors in the Federal Republic. Aside from that, the SDI agreement ensures the exchange of information on research results between defense officials and guarantees an exchange of expertise pertaining to SDI technology that is useful in improving conventional defense in general and air defense in particular.

The U.S. Government expressly states in the agreement that it will heed its commitments under the ABM treaty in research cooperation with German partners. [applause]

Decisions about developing and deploying strategic defense systems are not the subject of the agreement, nor does the U.S. side expect them before the beginning of the next decade. The agreement does not detail any advance decision in that respect. In other words, the so-called firewall between research and application of research results -- a phrase Lord Carrington coined -- has been set up.

Research within the framework of the SDI program is, of course, adaptable to military use. I would like to stress that, because in the past there was a silly quarrel over whether what agreement involves is of civilian or military nature. It is absolutely clear, ladies and gentlemen, that the research is done with a military intention. Yet the research is confined to theoretical exploration of such military intentions. It does not proceed to application. That was expressly guaranteed by the reference to the ABM treaty.

Research itself does not, however, stipulate the option of applying its results. For that reason it would be a narrow approach to declare exclusively military any fundamental research activities only because they can also be utilized for military purposes. The civilian character of research is also illustrated by the fact that by all that we can visualize today, German contractors will contribute research results that they have already developed within the framework of civilian projects.

In the agreements, the Federal Government did not have to alter any of the positions it had taken in its government statements. [applause] This is demonstrated by the express reference to the Federal Government statements of 27 March and 18 April 1986, and to the cabinet decision of 18 December 1985, and by the fact that the United States likewise expressly reaffirms in the SDI agreement the observance of the U.S. -Soviet ABM treaty of 1972.

Besides, ladies and gentlemen -- and I ask you to note this in the interest of the Federal Republic and in your own interests -- strategic SDI issues are of considerable security policy relevance for the entire alliance; and it is there that this discussion is conducted, ladies and gentlemen.

The corresponding consultations in the Western European Union and NATO are intense. Their goal is to preserve the alliance context and promote European security interests. Anyone who would prevent such a discussion in the alliance, or replace it with individual discussions between countries, would harm the interests of the Federal Republic. [applause]

Participation in information exchanges enhances the perception and judgment of the research program results. That is indispensable for the above-mentioned security-policy discussion within the framework of the NATO joint strategy. As to the problem of the strategic defensive systems in the overall context of deterrence to preserve peace, the information flow is important in introducing into the discussion and, if necessary, jointly implementing European and national security-policy objectives and demands.

The agreement does not envisage any state participation. The Federal Government does, however, support German industry in establishing contacts with the U.S. Administration. The agreements afford a number of options for consultation and discussion among the parties involved. Thus, the Federal Government can, during bid invitations and other contract-preparing acts, make it clear through information passed to the U.S. Government that German expertise can be contributed to research. On the other hand, through an active information policy, the Federal Government can show companies and research institutes where the companies can exploit their chances.

The agreement contains clear definitions. It opens consultation options in individual cases. This is necessary, in view of the complicated substance of different legal systems and the different usages in the economy and in research in the two countries, to avoid to the extent possible any disadvantage to German participants. Anyone in our country doing high technology research and deciding for participation in the SDI research program on the basis of their freedom of enterprise should be given the option of participating in the research without any competition-distorting conditions and without discrimination. This, ladies and gentlemen, is the task of a government. It must ensure that the companies can do so, that they can make their own decisions against the background of fair terms, while retaining complete freedom of organization and choice. And we have achieved that without any restriction. [applause]

It goes without saying that within the framework of our foreign trade law [AWG] and independent of the SDI research agreement, interested German companies are completely free to conclude contracts with the U.S. ordering agency. The agreement is merely a framework to guarantee the protection of interests of German parties in the economy and in research. Of greatest importance is protection of the commercial rights and titles to research results contributed by the contractor to the project agreed upon with the ordering agency or developed by the contractor at his own expense in the process of implementing the order; equal treatment of German and U.S. contractors, especially regarding research results developed in line with implementing the SDI research order; full information by U.S. authorities to any party interested in contracts about everything required for successful bidding; protection against excessive security-classification; and commitment of the U.S. Government to pursue to the best of its ability the civilian utilization of unclassified research results.

Ladies and gentlemen, all these results -- and I am telling you about the results today -- correspond to the cabinet order to improve the legal position of those German research institutes and companies that are willing to participate in the SDI research program. I can state that we were able to implement what we proposed to do. In his statement of 18 April 1985, the Federal chancellor reiterated that SDI research cooperation must guarantee fair partnership and free exchange of findings, that it must not become a technological one-way street, and -- as far as is possible -- secure an independent research field, thus giving us the opportunity to influence the project as a whole.

The principle of fair partnership and free exchange of findings is one of the central principles of the agreement. The fields of research, which are of particular interest to us, have been specifically stipulated in rules and regulations. The demand for cooperation on the basis of fair partnership has found expression in equal treatment of American and German contractors for successful bidding.

The regulations about using nonclassified research results for civilian purposes demonstrate that participation in the research program will not end up in a technological one-way street. It must be emphasized that the agreement stipulates as one goal of cooperation to allow German companies and research institutes to participate in the program according to their capacities. Because we consciously decided against state participation, our impact on the total composition of the SDI program will naturally be limited.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me draw your attention to the following: Criticism of the government's project and the results is quite contradictory, because the same people who first rejected the whole program now complain about our lack of influence on the total process. Such criticism is not logical and it shows how little our argumentation, our goals have been understood. [applause]

The cabinet order was to create a framework for German economic partners. Since then the Federal Ministry for Economics has held consultations with economically interested parties to formulate negotiation goals. The parties consider the negotiation results to be practice-oriented and positive. The agreement on technological cooperation contains a Berlin clause, which makes Berlin part of this agreement. In connection with the agreement on participation of German companies and 2 research institutes in research work within the SDI framework, Berlin's technological, scientific, and industrial resources are taken into account by the U.S. side, considering the special status of the city. Thus the Federal Government has fulfilled its commitment to include Berlin in the two agreements.

The two agreements are not secret agreements, esteemed ladies and gentlemen. The responsible Bundestag commissions were fully informed.

Esteemed ladies and gentlemen of the opposition, I have offered my services to the economic, defense, and foreign commissions as long as they request me to do so. The process of informing was not interrupted [unidentified persons interput] -- the process of informing was not interrupted. I have fully answered all questions about the respective articles of the two agreements. The text of the two agreements is available at the Bundestag classified library. Every delegate can study them. Everyone was fully informed.

And, Mr Roth, if that is not enough for you, I am willing to inform you privately. [unidentified interruptions]

The U.S. desire for confidential treatment -- and that is the only stumbling block the opposition can possibly find [unidentified interruptions] -- Mr Vogel you are welcome to find another stumbling block -- I do not mind.

The U.S. desire for confidential treatment, Mr SPD Floorleader, must be viewed against the background of continuous negotiations with a number of other countries. It goes without saying that a country which holds simultaneous negotiations with several other contracting partners has an interest in having the results of the negotiations with the individual partners treated confidentially. By the way, the agreement with Great Britain has also been treated confidentially. As you know, the British Parliament was also informed orally. For these reasons we agreed with the U.S. Government not to publish the text, and we stand by that.

The conclusion of the accords is an important step toward broadening the basis for industrial and research cooperation with the United States. They constitute a framework and at the same time open up prospects that interested German parties should utilize. It is not the Federal Government's task to fill in the accords. However, it will inform the interested parties about the contents in an appropriate way and in due detail.

Finally, let me deal with the claim that the accords require approval. The Federal Government is of the view that the memorandum of understanding on participation in SDI research and the joint memorandum of understanding on principle on the exchange of technologies do not require approval by the Bundestag. They are not political treaties as defined by Article 59, paragraph 2, clause 1 of the basic law. They do not regulate the Federal Government's political relations as defined by the jurisdiction of the Federal Constitutional Court. They do not deal with problems that concern the Federal Republic's existence or status. Nor do the accords refer to subject matters of federal jurisdiction. In particular, no federal law is necessary to execute the two memoranda.

In conclusion, I want to point out quite clearly that signing the accords on SDI research does not constitute a change in the policy consistently pursued by the Federal Government of actively contributing to East-West arms control and disarmament efforts. The statement by the Federal chancellor on 18 April 1985, that it is our goal to create peace with fewer and fewer weapons and to establish more stability in East-West relations still holds true. That is also the guideline of our policy regarding the U.S. SDI project. [applause]

As the Federal chancellor also said on the same day, the Federal Government believes it to be indispensable to find cooperative solutions, before decisions are made on matters other than research. Ladies and gentlemen, we continue to hope for an implementation of the U.S.-Soviet joint statement in Geneva on 8 January, that both sides strive for negotiations whose goal it is to draw up effective agreements to prevent the arms race in space and put an end to it on earth. [applause]

KOHL: BUNDESTAG STANCE ON SDI 'HYPOCRITICAL'

DW171321 Cologne Westdeutscher Rundfunk Network in German 0824 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Speech by Chancellor Helmut Kohl at Bundestag -- live]

[Test] Mr President, esteemed ladies and gentlemen: I paid great attention to the first contribution of the SPD faction speaker here. One thing is remarkable about that speech, and I think we should discuss it thoroughly today. Colleague Elmke, you said that you do not criticize the U.S. SDI program -- you can look it up in the protocol, you said it -- but rather the Federal Government's participation in it.

Ladies and gentlemen, what do you actually want? You have spoken in this house for many months against the U.S. SDI program. You charge us more or less with being an accomplice, and you try to excite people in this matter through the peace movement, Easter marches, and on many other occasions. What you are, however, is enormously hypocritical. I must say that clearly. [applause]

It is important to clarify in today's debate what you really want. Do you just want to add a new chapter to anti-Americanism, or are you really prepared to make your reasonable contribution to detente and disarmament policy?

Ladies and gentlemen, the problem of strategic defense is a decisive issue of international security. It is natural that in view of the tension in the world it has a special effect on East-West relations. Nevertheless -- and I want to stress it here again -- it would be absolutely wrong from my point of view to make strategic defense and especially the SDI program a focal point of East-West relations and to subordinate all other issues to this subject. If you follow attentively the discussion between the world powers, you will see that the tendency you cultivate in the FRG is not present there at all.

Ladies and gentlemen, such a simplified attitude does not do justice to the existing facts. Mr Bahr, you will have a problem eliminating that quote. I can understand that quite well. [shouts] I have always maintained that East-West relations cannot be limited to disarmament and arms control or even merely to SDI. From the FRG's point of view, from Germany's point of view, it is most important to point out repeatedly that East-West relations are of a manifold nature and that these relations contain political, military, economic, scientific-technological, and cultural elements of great importance to us.

Ladies and gentlemen, agreements in the field of disarmament and arms control will be possible and strong in the long run if the other fields, and especially political relations, are developed broadly, and if talks at all levels will remain possible. The actual state of arms control negotiations proves that today, compared with the situation years ago, most far-reaching negotiation proposals have been made by both sides. And yet talks in important fields are stagnating. They need a new political boost. We all think and hope that such a boost will arise from the meeting between General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan in the United States this year. One reason for that development is the fact that of confidence-building process between the two sides has not yet advanced far enough. However, one must add that, fortunately, more signs in the past few months have indicated that the Soviet leadership also attributes more importance to the entire breadth of relations. I noticed that General Secretary Gorbachev, in his speech at the 27th CPSU Congress, intentionally placed his disarmament program in the general political context. He said that security cannot be maintained with military means only, that it is mainly a political task.

Ladies and gentlemen, if problems of strategic defense are negotiated, it must be considered that both world powers pursue research work. None of us can prevent them from doing it. It is a reality that research cannot be controlled. However, we will not and cannot allow the Soviet Union's activities in this field to be ignored and the U.S. research work to be repeatedly put into the propaganda spotlight. [applause]

It is a fact, ladies and gentlemen, that the Soviet Union is the only country to actually build up an antiballistic missile defense system around its capital, Moscow. The Soviet Union is the only country that has a system of antisatellite weapons which is ready for use and which it has tested in space. Ladies and gentlemen, where were your protests? Why did you not go out into the streets and squares then? [applause]

The Soviet Union is modernizing its strategic defense system around Moscow. You know as well as I do that thousands of Soviet researchers work in that field. That Soviet research -- my FDP colleague just drew attention to it -- has progressed far in important fields of technology such as laser research and the exploration of particle radiation. Some experts say that they have advanced farther than many Western countries.

Ladies and gentlemen, by the same token it is true that Soviet research has been going on for more than 15 years. And, Deputy Ehmske, I have been in office for more than 3 years. When you conducted government business here, what did you do in the dialogue with the Soviet Union to draw attention to those things?

All this indicates that the Soviet Union has, earlier and more consistently than the United States, pursued a systematic and serious implementation of strategic missile defense. The Soviet leadership claims that everything it does is in keeping with the ABM Treaty. None of us is in a position to verify whether that contention is true or not.

At any rate, the Soviet Union and its propaganda machinery has succeeded in diverting attention from its own research and its own developments, and we have heard nothing of what you have done to enlighten the people. On the contrary, you merely talk about U.S. research, withholding what the Soviet Union has done. [applause]

Ladies and gentlemen of the SPD, is it not amazing that the United States repeatedly declares with reference to the SDI research program that it is acting in conformity with treaties and observing the ABM Treaty? You then question those statements. Why is it that you believe the Soviet protestation while constantly raising your sceptical questions about our most important alliance partner, who has for decades helped guarantee our security and peace in Europe? This, after all, must have some motive, which needs to be pondered. I tell you that the Americans are prepared to open the research institutes and allow visits; the Soviet Union would not dream of granting us comparable options.

Ladies and gentlemen, our attitude toward the U.S. SDI research program must be adapted to our long-term interests and objectives. It remains our most important political objective to safeguard peace, reliably prevent wars, and drastically to reduce the armament level in general and in nuclear weapons in particular. We approve the joint U.S.-Soviet statement of 8 January 1985 which forms the basis of the present efforts to prevent an arms race on earth and in space. In that respect the Strategic Defense Initiative may well be an important vehicle. On the one hand, we cannot but find today that the Soviet Union has submitted drastic reduction proposals only; after the U.S. President promulgated his initiative in March 1983; on the other hand, it may be even more realistic to pursue a reduction plan that would render offensive nuclear weapons increasingly more useless through defense systems rather than trying to achieve the goal through defense systems rather than trying to achieve the goal through negotiations.

Ladies and gentlemen, beyond that, defense systems will provide the certainty that despite the remaining capability of building nuclear weapons, it would be nonsensical to do so. There are many indications today that a total abolition of all nuclear weapons, which we also desire, will not likely be attainable in the foreseeable future. Conversely, it is quite conceivable to set up a new system of strategic stability in which both sides come to terms on a drastic reduction of offensive nuclear systems, establish a drastic reduction of offensive nuclear systems, establish a limited number of strategic defense systems, maybe only ground-based, in a joint interpretation of strategic stability taking into account the overall military power ratio.

Despite the current controversies and differences, the superpowers have parallel interests and objective obligations which could, however, also lead to an understanding. The huge arms burdens and the uncertainty about technological and strategic developments offer a real chance to bring East and West closer together. Without expecting too much from Moscow's statements, we recognize a growing flexibility in the Soviet leadership.

On the road from the present state of overarmament to a new system of strategic stability with fewer weapons, there are, of course, risks that must be overcome. The security of the alliance as a whole must remain politically and militarily guaranteed. Europe's security, including Germany's security, must not be of secondary importance. [applause] Conventional imbalances are becoming more dangerous and must be limited.

Mr Bahr, you are nodding and smiling. Why did you not vote to extend military service this week, which is a prerequisite for creating a balance? [applause] You cannot be against the extension of military service and at the same time advocate the elimination of imbalances.

The risk of a new arms race can and must be eliminated by a resolute arms control policy. [shouts]

Ladies and gentlemen, your presence here essentially consists of making offensive remarks. That is largely your contribution. [applause] You appear here as representatives of pacifism, and you have introduced a note here which reminds us of the worst times of the Weimar Republic. [applause, shouts] However, I said earlier that Bonn is not Weimar. We will yield to neither leftist nor rightist fascism in this republic. [applause, shouts]

Ladies and gentlemen, the Federal Government continues to see that there is an inter-relationship between offensive and defensive arms. A clearly reduced number of offensive systems will determine the issue of the necessity and quantity of space-based defensive systems, as I had already said in my statement in March 1985. I am convinced that research in the Soviet Union and in the United States will thoroughly change the strategic conditions which until now have preserved peace in freedom. German and European security interests are directly affected by it. Therefore, political common sense makes it absolutely necessary to prepare now for such foreseeable developments.

Ladies and gentlemen, if we want to continue to preserve our security interests we must not only be informed about those processes but we must also try to gain as much influence over them as possible. That is why we want to be constantly in touch with the United States on the state and development of the SDI program. The SDI program must not separate us Europeans from the United States -- not technologically, not strategically, not politically.

Ladies and gentlemen, I do not know why you comment on that program and the negotiations by Colleague Bangemann in the way you have done here. The Italian Government, led by your political friend Craxi, is currently conducting similar negotiations. The Italians are about to conclude a similar program. Great Britain also did it. [shouts]

Colleague Vogel, your interjection about France is equally absurd. You know as well as I do -- if you were in my place, you would say that my excitement shows my guilty conscience [laughter, shouts, applause] -- your excitement in my view only shows how uninformed you are. That is something entirely different. [applause, shouts] As for France, colleague Vogel, what did President Francois Mitterrand say? He said -- and I quote -- At this point the French Government is not participating in the SDI program. Period. However, at the same time he did nothing to prevent the French enterprises, which are entirely state-owned, from being the first to conclude contracts with the Pentagon on SDI programs. [applause, shouts]

It is clear for everyone to see that France -- excuse me, I do not blame him for anything, you only wrongly claim him for yourselves. That is something entirely different. You are dealing with facts in a very disturbing way, ladies and gentlemen. [commotion] It is clear for everyone to see that given the different economic structures between the FRG and France -- we have no nationalized industries, the German Government and the German Parliament have no influence whatever on orders given or received by German enterprises, whereas in France the government clearly can give instructions to nationalized enterprises. The French do not have to consider a number of such agreements because they have direct access. Everybody can see that. You know that as well as I do. [shouts]

Excuse me, the FRG [words indistinct], and Mr Strauss is not the Federal Republic. [shouts] But Mr Vogel, Mr Strauss also is not [commotion] [words indistinct]. Ladies and gentlemen, I think we should forget about colleague Vogel's Franz-Josef Strauss complex and return to SDI. [commotion]

Ladies and gentlemen, information, consultation, and participation in research are indispensable elements of the Federal Government's long-term policy aimed at the cohesion of the alliance and ensuring peace in Europe. Ladies and gentlemen of the SPD, you condemned the SDI research program. As Volker Ruehe rightly said, you thereby have withdrawn from the decisionmaking process which, to a decisive degree, also affects our national security interests. I regret that. In fact, it has become a problem for the Social Democrats to continue to move away from their previous ideas.

That applies primarily to security and defense policy. Mr Vogel, those who demand the rescinding of counterarmament before the Geneva negotiations have come to an end, know full well that they will accomplish nothing. Those who negotiate a nuclear-free zone in central Europe with the SED in East Berlin know that they can exert no positive international influence. [applause]

Ladies and gentlemen, those who -- in this situation, where we must all join efforts -- negotiate on a chemical weapons-free zone with the communist parties of the GDR and the CSSR, while in Geneva they are striving for a worldwide ban, must know that they give up their opportunity to exert influence.

Ladies and gentlemen, those who demand that NATO not have a structural offensive capability [strukturelle nicht-angriffsfahigkeit], thus directly opposing NATO strategy, know very well what path they have taken -- we say that frankly. By the way, because you were speaking about honesty, Mr Elmke the most honest man among you, pleasantly honest, completely frank, is Mr Lafontaine. He says what many of you think. [applause] He says: We will leave NATO integration by withdrawing the Bundeswehr. That is the new policy pursued by the majority of the German Social Democrats. [applause] You should not talk about reliability.

Mr Vogel, we learn that you visited Beijing and reported that the Beijing state leadership denounces SDI. You should not have to go there for that reason; I could have assured you of that as well. The PRC's interests are completely different. It is the interest of the PRC and its capital Beijing that the Germans and Europeans say in the debate on the SS-20: We will not tolerate them being transferred from the European part to the Asian part of the USSR. That is in the PRC's favor.

But let me ask you: Why did Mr Rau -- who was in Israel at the same time -- why did Mr Rau not take the opportunity to speak with your Israeli political friend, with Shimon Peres, about that. You could have learned a lot. And you, who on any occasion make yourself the guardians of those interests, why do you not say that, for instance, Israeli participation in SDI is of vital interest, and that I got a lot of encouragement from there, from your socialist friends and partners. Let me summarize our position in a few sentences.

First, security policy problems must be seen and assessed within the context of East-West relations. That also applies to the SDI research program.

Second, both world powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, do research work in the field of antiballistic missiles defense. The results of that research work will change strategic conditions in the world. Strategic defensive systems will then play a new role.

Third, in view of such developments, political efforts are necessary for a new cooperative security system between the two world powers.

Fourth, there are risks and it is our duty to contribute to making those risks controllable. That requires a cooperative attitude among the alliance partners, but also, ladies and gentlemen, making use of joint East-West interests. That can only be achieved by dialogue and cooperation.

German and European interests require that we prepare ourselves for this development of the future, that we exert political influence in order to safeguard our national interests. That alone dictates our policy. [vigorous applause]

SPD'S EHNKE OPPOSES FRG INVOLVEMENT IN SDI

LD171156 Hamburg DPA in German 0840 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] [no dateline as received] -- "We insist on the publication of the agreement along with the accompanying correspondence," was the demand of the SPD political leader Horst Ehnke in the SDI debate. His party is decidedly against this "collective blackout." The SPD's main criticism remains the now documented support for Reagan's space project. The deputy chairman of the SPD group in the Bundestag accused the Federal chancellor of striving to conclude the agreement on SDI research and technological exchange mainly in the party's interest and not in the interest of the entire country.

Ehnke told the Federal minister of economic affairs that it was "simply not true" that these were nonmilitary treaties. The proof to the contrary was provided by the U.S. attitude to a nuclear test ban, which Washington refused because further nuclear tests were needed for SDI research. Bangemann's much-vaunted equation of FRG and U.S. companies in SDI research was in truth a dangerous submission, said Ehnke, since the U.S. companies [as received] would be subject to considerable, national restrictions.

In a sharply worded retort, Volker Ruehe, deputy chairman of the CDU/CSU party group, turned the tables and accused the SPD of doing dangerous damage to FRG interests through "foot-dragging in the alliance." He also accused the opposition of tendencies toward left-wing radical anti-Americanism, revealed in the use of word "lickspittles" by Egon Bahr.

Ruehe did not think the secrecy of the agreement was an important point for discussion, because the critical issues could be discussed "without our having to go to the Bundestag office for protection of secret material." On behalf of his party group, Ruehe welcomed the agreements and congratulated Kohl on them because the FRG, in contrast with the SPD's view, could have more influence over SDI research. "Anyone who sees it differently is damaging FRG interests."

Ruehe was reserved in his remarks about a nuclear test ban. An end to the tests alone would not remove a single nuclear weapon, the CDU politician said. The Soviet Union should declare its willingness to go into parallel negotiations on disarmament and a test ban; perhaps then intermediate steps such as Chancellor Kohl's suggestion of a temporary pause in nuclear tests would be possible.

WOERNER REJECTS SPD 'ACCUSATION' ON SDI ROLE

LD171206 Hamburg DPA in German 1051 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Excerpt] [no dateline as received] -- The SPD accusation that the Federal Government shares political responsibility for a program to build new strategic weapons was rejected by Defense Minister Manfred Woerner as a "crude distortion." Woerner repeated the coalition parties' argument that only participation in SDI could also ensure the ability to exert influence in favor of European interests. Concerns about possible future developments in the FRG's policy toward the East expressed by Egon Bahr (SPD), were answered by Woerner, who said that a "rational policy toward the East" could only be made by someone who "does not bend a knee" to Moscow. This distinguishes his own position from that of the SPD with its "preemptive capitulation" to Soviet interests.

ROMANIA'S VADUVA ARRIVES, MEETS WITH BANGEMANN

LD162216 Hamburg DPA in German 1231 GMT 16 Apr 86

[Excerpt] Bonn, 16 Apr (DPA) -- Romanian Foreign Minister Ilie Vaduva arrived in the Federal Republic on Wednesday for a 3-day official visit. He met initially with representatives of industry and with Federal Economics Minister Martin Bangemann (FDP) for talks on economic policy. Talks between the Romanian guest and Federal President Richard von Weizsäcker and Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl and with opposition politicians are planned for Friday.

ROK PRESIDENT CHON TU-HWAN ARRIVES IN BONN 10 APR

LD101104 Hamburg DPA in German 1001 GMT 10 Apr 86

[Excerpt] Bonn, 10 Apr (DPA) -- South Korean President Chon Tu-hwan arrived in Bonn on Thursday on a 2-day working visit. He was welcomed with military honors at the Federal President's official residence by Federal President Richard von Weizsäcker. Afterwards both presidents met for a talk.

In a greetings message on his arrival at Cologne-Bonn Airport, Chun spoke of the joint fate of Germany and Korea as divided nations. He wants to hold an exchange of views in the FRG about how both countries could alleviate the tragedy of the division in a joint effort and finally achieve peaceful reunification.

[Seoul YONHAP in English at 1007 GMT on 10 April in a similar report on Chon's arrival in Bonn, adds the following: "Chon said that Seoul and Bonn should develop their existing cooperative relations in all fields and that he expects to hold discussions with West German leaders on ways for the two nations, as 'mature partners,' to contribute to world peace and develop significant bilateral relations."]

MAJORITY'S 'SERIOUS DIFFICULTIES' OVER U.S. ATTACK

LD171825 Paris Domestic Service in French 1800 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] The U.S. action against Libya and the French Government's reaction have caused the first serious difficulties within the majority in France: Jean Lecanuet and Valéry Giscard d'Estaing have approved the U.S. action. Moreover, an astonishing scene took place this afternoon in the National Assembly within the Foreign Affairs Committee: On behalf of the Socialists Roland Dumas and Lionel Jospin paid tribute to the government's coolness in this affair.

Return to 'Gaullist Tradition'

AU171515 Paris AFP in English 1504 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Excerpts] Paris, April 17 (AFP) — The United States did not formally ask French approval for its bombers to cross France so they could attack Libya "because it knew we would not give authorization," government spokesman Denis Baudouin said here Thursday.

But French Foreign Minister Jean-Bernard Raimond said Wednesday that the government has turned down a U.S. request, the declaration added confusion to reports that Washington was rebuffed by the French Government.

French Foreign Minister Jean-Bernard Raimond said Wednesday that the United States "asked us for permission", but that "our response was that it was not possible for us to give such authorization."

However Mr. Baudouin said that "we hinted that we were not very keen on the flyover, and that we would, almost certainly, not give them authorization." He said that President Ronald Reagan's special emissary General Vernon Walters said in Paris at the weekend: "I will not ask permission because I know you will not give it."

The spokesman said France had been informed, "through ambassador channels", of a possible U.S. raid and that it had been asked what its reaction would be if asked for permission to fly over France. "The president (François Mitterrand) and (Prime Minister) Jacques Chirac then agreed that the flight should be banned," he said. Mr. Baudouin said the ban did not affect the Americans technical plans.

He said it showed a return to a "Gaullist tradition" that "France does not take part in things that it has not decided itself."

POLITICAL PARTIES REACT TO LIBYA DEVELOPMENTS

PH180951 Paris LE MONDE in French 17 Apr 86 pp 6-7

[Unattributed report: "Contrasting Reactions in French Political Circles"]

[Text] The European states' response if Libya carried out its threats against Italy and Spain will have to be "appropriate and firm," Mr Chirac said in the Senate Tuesday 15 April. Thus the prime minister added firmness to the communique issued by the Quai d'Orsay the previous day after consultation between the Elysee and Matignon. In French political circles, reactions to the U.S. initiative range from total approval (National Front, National Center of Independents and Peasants [CNIP], and senators in the Democratic Left group) to outright condemnation (PCF, extreme left).

[National Front leader] Le Pen deplored "Europe's impotent attitude" toward terrorism. "The series of minor capitulations which has so far served as Europe's policy can only lead to a rapid extension of the conflict to our countries and increase the pressure on our free will," he said. CNIP Chairman Malaud expressed regret that France had refused permission for U.S. planes to overfly its territory. The senators in the Democratic Left group approved of "the American nation's response" and deplored "the lack of solidarity" from European nations and from the French Government. "It is time," they said, "that France pursued a courageous and firm policy."

So far reactions from the centrists have been closer to the official position adopted by the government. Centrist Union Senator Genton, chairman of the Senate Foreign Affairs Commission, said it was "deplorable" that the United States had been forced to intervene. "This U.S. engagement is very serious," he said. But he thinks that, faced with terrorism, "it is obvious that the European nations should face up to it at the same time as the United States."

However, Mr Lecanuet, chairman of the Social Democratic Center party and of the National Assembly Foreign Affairs Commission, thinks that the French position is "fluctuating." He called for explanations and "clarifications" from the Foreign Ministry on the meaning of the European countries' "appropriate response." "What response?" he added. Mrs Simone Veil thinks that "the United States cannot be condemned in the circumstances." She called on the European governments to have consultations "with all other countries, especially the Arab countries," to demonstrate the international community's disapproval of terrorism and to seek "ways of eliminating it."

Radical Party Secretary General Yves Galland condemned the "state terrorism" practiced by Libya and expressed the view that "the escalation was predictable and inevitable," although he regretted "the surge of violence engendered by the U.S. response." He questioned the justification for maintaining diplomatic relations with Libya.

Of the Socialists, only former External Relations Minister Roland Dumas published a detailed reaction Tuesday. He thinks it is primarily up to the European countries -- "the main targets of international terrorism" -- to "take action against the terrorists with all the means at their disposal." He pointed out that the European states "bordering on the Mediterranean" cannot "sit back and watch the increase in tension in this region."

The PCF Politburo, for its part, condemned the "U.S. aggression" which, according to it, constitutes "one of the most serious acts of state terrorism carried out in recent years." This "aggression," the PCF added, "is part of the increased threats and actions which reflect a deliberate policy of resorting to force with all the ensuing risks of escalation."

The Unified Socialist Party uses the same word "aggression" to describe President Reagan's "ill-considered and adventurist decision." Speaking for the Revolutionary Communist League, Mr Krivine also spoke of "state terrorism." Mr Bauby (Party for a Communist Alternative) wants to "prevent U.S. imperialism becoming the world's Rambo 5." The Greens described the U.S. initiative as an act of "international terrorism."

LE FIGARO REVIEWS LIBYA ATTACK ARGUMENTS

PM171505 Paris LE FIGARO in French 16 Apr 86 p 1

[Max Clos editorial: "Legitimate Defense"]

[Text] After seeing the movie "Rambo," President Reagan said: "I have learned what has to be done." He has done it.

For the second time -- but in a much more powerful way -- his bombers have pounded Libya. He commented: "I will do it again if necessary."

Is he right or wrong? It would be inappropriate to reply by acclamation or condemnation. Human beings have been physically attacked. Let us look at the arguments.

Against: Bombing is an ineffective weapon, it will not change the orders which Colonel al-Qadhafi may have given terrorist commandos already on U.S. territory or in European countries. The American raid is bound to discourage moderates in the Muslim world and, instead strengthen Islamic fanatics who are now motivated by a spirit of vengeance. Those who are "against" this action clearly fear above all that Mr Reagan's initiative will have the effect of sparking off a wave of terrorist reprisals of which we too would be the victims.

For: Terrorism is a kind of war, and can only be tackled by warfare. The idea that it is possible to negotiate, to come to arrangements with murderers is ridiculous. It sends fools to the slaughter. This war is justified by legitimate self-defense. Moreover there is no other means: You do not kill the octopus by cutting off its tentacles but by cutting off its hand.

The French position in this debate is cautious to say the least. The Quai d'Orsay deplores "the intolerable escalation in terrorism" and "the spiral of violence" but says it is in favor of an "appropriate response" if Europe is affected.

This leaves many points unclarified. Who is responsible for "the escalation in terrorism?" Is it Col al-Qadhafi or somebody else? What does an "appropriate response" mean? Where do you respond? Against whom do you direct this response if you do not know who the aggressor is? What means do you use? Do you use the same means as Mr Reagan? But, in that case, why give the impression of disapproving of him now?

This raises two questions.

First, do we believe in international terrorism or not? do we believe that one organization is planning violent operations against the west, including France? If the answer is no, let us forget all this and sit back and do nothing. If it is yes, we must think about how to face the threat.

Second, how do we face it? On the external front we must start by pinpointing the enemy. On the domestic front security measures must be introduced immediately. Three such measures are obvious: use of informers to infiltrate support networks for foreign terrorists, without which they cannot operate; tougher police checks; rapid and harsh legal penalties for killers.

There is another measure. It is essential. Public opinion does not know that France is likely to be faced with a tragic problem in the near future. One of the government's essential tasks -- one which is difficult, thankless, and probably unpopular at first -- is to make the French people understand that somebody wants to kill them.

Of course, we could just send wreaths to the funerals.

LE MATIN ON 'PREDICTABLE' U.S.-LIBYA CLASH

PM181139 Paris LE MATIN in French 16 Apr 86 p 4

[Benoit Rayski editorial: "Third-Rate Movie"]

[Text] For those who like realistic movies with the sound of real bombs dropping, real casualties, and real destruction, Ronald Reagan and Mu'ammarr al-Qadhafi have each supplied ample material for a disaster movie in their own ways and playing their own roles. The former -- and he is proudly claiming responsibility for it before a satisfied America -- sent his fighter-bombers to drop bombs on Tripoli and Benghazi. The latter -- he denies it but all the evidence is against him -- has inspired, supported, and financed some terrorist actions which have left innocent civilian casualties in various parts of Europe and elsewhere. It would be tempting to leave things at that and allow Reagan and Al-Qadhafi to face each other, and view yesterday's American response as one of the incidents (although a particularly tragic one) in the duel between the Libyan colonel, consumed by his hatred for the United States, and the U.S. President, fiercely determined to wipe the Libyan leader's regime, which he regards as evil, from the face of the earth.

But everybody feels that it is something very different from a bad remark of a bad Western which could be called: "Gunfight at O.K. Tripoli"... It is nonetheless obvious that in the distribution of roles there is a good guy, a thug, and a villain, and that Ronald Reagan may claim, with some justification, that he is the sheriff or marshal even if the overwhelming impression is that he is extremely trigger-happy.

The tragedy in this affair -- the victims of terrorism and the civilian victims of the bombing of Tripoli and Benghazi are there to show that it is indeed a tragedy -- is that in the American-Libyan trial of strength everything is highly predictable, except, of course, the end. Al-Qadhafi's call for vengeance and the fact that vengeance was taken on the Italian island of Lampedusa were predictable.

The disarray of the European states was also predictable -- states which, although they are U.S. allies, were unable to decide to what extent they should participate, and which preferred to virtually equate terrorist violence with the U.S. counterviolence; European states which, without having wished it, are now in the exposed position of responding to Al-Qadhafi, as they had promised to do if he struck southern Europe.

Finally, it was to be expected that Al-Qadhafi would become a legend, and this is already happening; he is becoming both a victim and a hero in the eyes of the Arab masses. When everything is as predictable as this, with events following each other automatically, as in a movie, we must be allowed to regard it as a third-rate movie. The fact remains that the end is not predictable, but we cannot hope for a happy ending for the United States, Libya, or Europe (as we are already seeing).

LIBYANS FACE EXPULSION; NO REASONS OFFERED

[Text] Paris, April 18 (AFP) -- Four Libyans are to be expelled from France for activities likely to disturb public order, the government announced Friday. Robert Pandraud, minister delegate for security, said the Libyans would be expelled soon. He gave no indication of when they were arrested or when they would be expelled. No official details would be released on the expulsions, he said. This included the precise date, the Libyans' destination, or "the exact reasons why the government has taken this decision."

Two Libyan diplomats were expelled from Paris at the beginning of the month after an investigation by French counter-espionage identified them as suspects in the preparation of terrorist attacks against American targets in France and the rest of Europe.

Libya Charges 'Disinformation'

AU181404 Paris AFP in English 1353 GMT 18 Apr 86

[Excerpts] Paris, April 18 (AFP) -- Four Libyans are to be expelled from France for activities likely to disturb public order, the government announced Friday.

The Libyan People's Bureau (embassy) here Friday said it did not know the identity of the four Libyans to be expelled. "This is disinformation from the U.S. and other intelligence services that want to show doubts over our relations with France," said People's Bureau Secretary (ambassador) Hamed al-Hudayri. He said he had asked the French Foreign Ministry for the names and passport numbers of the four to check their identity and the reasons for their expulsion. "They are neither diplomats nor Libyan nationals living in France, maybe people passing through," he added. "The question is, why they are being asked to leave if they have visas?"

CHIRAC, TUNISIA'S MZALI DISCUSS RAID ON LIBYA

LD172236 Paris International Service in French 2030 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] Jacques Chirac and Tunisian Prime Minister Mohamed Mzali spoke to each other on the telephone today about the consequences of the American raid on Libya.

CHIRAC OPTIMISTIC ABOUT GERMAN RELATIONS

LD172122 Paris Domestic Service in French 1500 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] Jacques Chirac, who paid a lightning visit to Bonn today, thinks that Franco-German cooperation will perhaps be easier than before following his first contact with Chancellor Helmut Kohl. The prime minister said he was keen that his first gesture after his appointment as head of the government should be to greet the West German chancellor. The talks I had with him show the capital import for French and European policy that I attach to the permanent consolidation of links between our two countries, added Chirac.

The two men, who had a total of 3 hours of talks, agreed to hold informal or official contacts as often as necessary.

MITTERRAND, JAPAN'S ABE PREVIEW TOKYO SUMMIT

OW180153 Tokyo KYODO in English 0136 GMT 18 Apr 86

[Text] Paris, April 17 KYODO -- Japanese Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe Thursday met French President Francois Mitterrand and asked his cooperation to make the Tokyo summit of seven advanced democracies a success.

Abe said the Tokyo summit May 4-6 will discuss antiterrorism measures, in addition to various agenda items already agreed, in the wake of U.S.-Libya conflicts.

Mitterrand said France did not oppose moves to counter international terrorism, according to officials who attended the meeting. Mitterrand pointed out, however, that France had not allowed U.S. bombers fly over its territory at short notice on their mission to attack Libya last Monday, according to the officials.

The French president also said he felt that leaders at previous summits had been unable to freely exchange ideas.

Abe on the same day also met his counterparts from Britain, the Netherlands and Luxembourg -- Sir Geoffrey Howe, Hans van den Broek and Jacques Poos. Representing the European Community (EC), the three foreign ministers expressed disappointment over the Soviet decision to postpone the Soviet-U.S. foreign ministers meeting and Abe said he shared their opinion.

On international terrorism, Abe said that international cooperation is vital to prevent terrorist acts and that is the reason why the Tokyo summit will discuss the matter.

POLICE ROUND UP DIRECT ACTION SUSPECTS, MONEY

AU171539 Paris AFP in English 1446 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] Paris, April 17 (AFP) -- Police swooping on 53 suspected members of the outlawed Action Directe (AD) extremist movement on Wednesday recovered 2.5 million francs (350,000 dollars) seized in a bank robbery last month. They said Thursday that raids were carried out at dawn Wednesday in Paris and in suburbs following the failed assassination attempt Tuesday on leading French industrialist Guy Brana. They are holding 13 suspected AD terrorists, believed linked with the attack.

At least two of those rounded up were found in possession of arms and explosives. One of them then led to two men holding part of the haul from the bank raid at Niort in western France. It was not immediately known whether they were members of Action Directe, or common criminals.

Six masked gunmen held up 30 employees of the Banque de France in Niort on March 4, and made off with 29 million francs (about four million dollars).

FOREIGN MINISTRY PROTESTS ATTACK ON LAMPEDUSA

AU181045 Rome ANSA in English 1042 GMT 18 Apr 86

[Text] (ANSA) Rome, April 18 -- The Libya claim that their attack on the island of Lampedusa was an "act of self-defence" is totally "inadmissible" for it has no "judicial or political foundation", according to a communique from the Italian Foreign Ministry released here.

In relation to the recent American attack on Libya and Tripoli's missile attack on Lampedusa, the Foreign Ministry said yesterday that it had instructed its ambassador in Libya to repeat, to Libyan authorities, Italy's position which is in line with that taken by the European Community as a whole. "The Italian position", the communique said, "is the following: Italy condemns the use of military force by the United States against Libya during the night between April 14 and 15 and this was stated by Prime Minister Bettino Craxi during his address to Parliament. Italy was and is in favor of a political solution to the crisis. This is the same position taken by EC foreign ministers during their meeting in the Hague on April 14. Italy particularly supports the EC declaration calling for moderation on both sides."

Furthermore, "Italy repeats its strong stand against terrorism and those nations which support it in any way. This is the same position", the communique points out, "taken by the European Community which in its last declaration pointed to Libya as one of these countries."

Regarding the attack on Lampedusa, the Foreign Ministry communique repeated its "most strong protest for the attack against Italian national territory and continues to consider it totally unjustifiable and the Libyan claim of self-defence as inadmissible with no juridical or political foundation."

"If the answer by the Libyan Government, to our note of protest, is to mean that Libyan reserves the right to carry out further attacks, then Italy must repeat that it will repulse any military initiative against its national territory with all the means at its disposal to defend any point of Italian territory."

Political, Military State of Alert

LD171642 Rome International Service in Italian 1555 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] There is a military and political state of alert in Italy. The Armed Forces have been instructed to defend every single point of the national territory. Tripoli's reply to the protest note by the Italian government over the Lampedusa (?missile attack) is regarded as unsatisfactory. Some ministers believe that the document cannot even be taken into consideration.

LAMPEDUSA UNABLE TO DETECT LIBYAN 'SCUD' MISSILES

AU170826 Rome ANSA in English 0816 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] (ANSA) -- Rome, April 16 -- The Libyan "Scud" missiles which fell close to the shores of Lampedusa on Tuesday in retaliation for the Monday night American air raid on two Libyan cities were too small to be detected by the island's radar system, according to sources close to the Italian Armed Forces. The missiles measure a mere eleven meters in length at departure, but shrink to no more than three meters almost immediately after firing when the boosters fall off.

Defense authorities said that the naked eye cannot detect such small objects on a radar screen. The Italian Air Force has two radar systems covering the area surrounding the island of Lampedusa, one in Marsala, near Trapani (Sicily), and another at Mezzogregorio, near Syracuse. The Argos-1 radar systems operating in the Mediterranean were built by Selenia and have a 460-kilometer range, with altitude coverage ranging from 150 meters to more than 24,000 meters.

SPADOLINI REJECTS CRITICISM OF LAMPEDUSA DEFENSE

Report To Defense Committee

AU171116 Rome ANSA in English 1054 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] (ANSA) Rome, April 17 -- The House Defence and Foreign Relations Committee, together with the Senate Defence Committee, held a joint meeting to review the recent developments in the southern Mediterranean, especially in regards to the Libyan missile attack on the island of Lampedusa, sources said here.

Defence Minister Giovanni Spadolini gave a report to yesterday's joint meeting on the measures which have been adopted following the U.S. attack on Libya. Spadolini said that "the criticism which arisen concerning our defence mechanism are totally without foundation". He then pointed out that "there does not exist a valid defence, in the whole world, against a missile attack launched from a distance of 300 kilometers". Spadolini told the joint meeting that Italy did not respond immediately to the Libyan attack because "this was a political matter, not a military one".

The Senate Defence Committee then asked the defence minister to supply them with a "punctual and complete" report on the events which led to the attack on Lampedusa. They added that they would ask the Senate to allow them to send a delegation to inspect the situation in the island.

LA STAMPA Interview

AU171232 Rome ANSA in English 1226 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] (ANSA) -- Rome, April 17 -- There is no defense against approaching missiles fired from afar, said Italian Defense Minister Giovanni Spadolini in an interview about the Libyan missile attack on the island of Lampedusa published in Turin's LA STAMPA daily today.

Defending the readiness and performance of Italian defense systems, Spadolini stressed that a "military protection belt" surrounding Lampedusa could effectively turn away approaching ships and aircraft. "In fact, no aircraft or ship 'perforated' the defense belt", he added. "There is simply no defense against long-range missiles". "We do not have a 'space shield' against oncoming missiles," Spadolini pointed out, "and neither the United States or the Soviet Union has any such defense system yet either."

But Italy's defense system showed a prompt capacity to detect, identify and react, insisted the defense chief, and "all warning systems worked to capacity performance". Two Libyan "Scud" missiles cut the waters off Lampedusa's shore on Tuesday in a retaliatory strike against the U.S. air raid on Tripoli and Benghazi. They were apparently aimed at a U.S. radar station for navigation on the island.

The interviewer asked Spadolini if the Italian Armed Forces were really capable of repelling a Libyan attack on Italian territory.

"The attack, if it were to come, would be mixture of military and terrorist actions. We have taken all possible defense measures against both. Naturally, there is no defense against a degree of terrorist criminality that escapes all longstanding and newly-devised strategic rules, and therefore all normal military measures and conventions".

Spadolini strongly denied any Italian involvement in the U.S. strikes on Libya Monday night. "The American Armed Forces got no support their anti-Al-Qadhafi operation from bases in Italy", he stressed.

MEASURES CONSIDERED IN WAKE OF LAMPEDUSA ATTACK

AU171108 Rome ANSA in English 1055 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] (ANSA) Rome, Apr 17 -- Italian President Francesco Cossiga chaired a meeting of Italy's Supreme Defence Council and Prime Minister Bettino Craxi one of his cabinet to discuss the Libyan missile attack on the island of Lampedusa, sources said here. Yesterday morning, Cossiga met at his official residence with the Defence Council and the focus of their meeting was on the measures Italy has at its disposal, both military and political, to defend its territory. Yesterday evening, Craxi and his cabinet examined the latest developments in Libya, especially in regards to the Italian community there. During their meeting, the cabinet also examined Tripoli's answer to Italy's protest note against the "act of war" Libya committed by firing missiles at Lampedusa.

According to Deputy Prime Minister Arnaldo Forlani, Libya's response "is based on facts which do not correspond to the truth," for example, that they destroyed the communications station on the island. Furthermore, Forlani said that "it was not clear" if the note excluded further attack against Italy. Referring to the Libyan note, Defence Minister Giovanni Spadolini said that Tripoli repeated that "they consider themselves at war with the United States and view NATO bases as American bases, thus they continue their policy of threats and provocation which have characterized, in recent days, all the statements made by (?the Libyans.)" The Libyan diplomatic response "is conditioned also by the evolution of the internal Libyan situation".

NO ITALIANS HURT, NO INTERESTS DAMAGED IN TRIPOLI

LD151919 Rome International Service in Italian 1730 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Text] We spoke earlier about the situation of our compatriots in Libya. So far, the news coming from the Italian Embassy in Tripoli is reassuring. During the contacts our diplomats had with the people in charge of the sites of many Italian firms operating in that Arab country, there was no indication of damage either to persons or property. Our Foreign Ministry has set up a telephone information service which can be contacted by Italian families to get news about their relatives in Libya. Phone links between the two countries work regularly although there could be difficulties because the lines are overloaded. Alitalia flights to Libya have been delayed.

LIBYA CONTACTED ON SAFETY, RETURN OF NATIONALS

UK, Austria Ask Aid

LD162024 Rome International in Italian 1730 GMT 16 Apr 86

[Text] Contacts with the Libyan Government are under way, the Foreign Ministry has said, with a view to securing the safety of our compatriots and facilitating the return of those who might want to leave Libya.

In a meeting held this morning, the Farnesina states, the various possibilities to be envisaged in connection with this return were examined in the light of the requests put by the British and Austrian Governments to include their respective nationals in the implementation of measures which might become a necessity.

No Multinational Evacuation Plan

AUL80829 Rome ANSA in English 0826 GMT 18 Apr 86

[Excerpt] (ANSA) Rome, April 17 -- The Foreign Ministry said that there was no change in the situation of members of the Italian community in Libya, including that of the four "Impresit" executives who had been moved, along with several employees, to a military camp near Tobruk.

The Farnesina denied reports by certain press organs to the effect that the Italian Government was forming a multi-national force for the evacuation of Italians and other foreigners from Libya. Close to eight thousand Italians live and work in Libya. The Foreign Ministry pointed out that the number is greatly reduced to that of the past, ten to twelve thousand.

Wednesday, the Italian Impresit construction firm, which is building a sewer system in Tobruk, announced that its workers had been moved from the construction site to a military camp.

FIRST FLIGHT FROM LIBYA SINCE RAID ARRIVES

AU172023 Paris AFP in English 2013 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] Rome, April 17 (AFP) -- A Libyan Airlines flight from Tripoli, the first to Europe since Tuesday's U.S. air raid, landed here late Thursday with 109 passengers on board. It was scheduled to take off again for the Libyan capital about an hour later with some 150 passengers, mostly Arabs, on board, but the departure was delayed until Friday because the captain was tired, an airline representative said. Some of the passengers have been waiting at the airport for the past three days.

Alitalia Cancels Libya Links

AU180817 Rome ANSA in English 0814 GMT 18 Apr 86

[Text] (ANSA) Rome April 17 -- Alitalia, like other European airlines, cancelled all its air links with Tripoli on Thursday until the Libyan situation is further clarified.

BISHOP 'UNDER HOUSE ARREST IN BANGHAZI'

AU171045 Rome ANSA in English 1025 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] (ANSA) Rome, April 17 -- Sources at the Vatican said that they believe that Bishop Giovanni Martinelli, apostolic vicar in Tripoli, is under house arrest in Banghazi and cannot communicate with the outside world except through the Libyan military which is keeping him under close guard. Yesterday morning, Libyan Ambassador to Rome 'Abd al-Rahman Shalgan had announced that the bishop had been released and was in his Banghazi residence. The bishop's collaborators say that they cannot get in touch with Martinelli in Banghazi, where he had been arrested last Thursday during a pastoral visit. The bishop usually resides in Tripoli. Vatican Radio said yesterday afternoon that they had received no official work on the prelate's release or his present whereabouts and welfare.

CAVACO SILVA BACK FROM FRG, DISCUSSES LIBYA

Support for EEC Stand

LD172245 Lisbon International Service in Portuguese 1900 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] Prime Minister Cavaco Silva reaffirmed on his return from an official visit to the FRG that the Portuguese Government supports the decision reached by the EEC foreign ministers in The Hague on the conflict between the United States and Libya, and he recommended dialogue as a means of fighting terrorism. The Portuguese Government counsels against the use of force and vehemently condemns international terrorism, added Professor Cavaco Silva, whose opinion is that the United States would be the country most affected by acts of terrorism. This leaves the Americans under great tension and has brought tension here, too. As a member of the EEC, Portugal can do nothing but be an active participant in defining European international policies, added the Portuguese prime minister. He gave assurances that his Cabinet is striving to fight terrorism. Wide-ranging political efforts should be developed at an international level, namely with the Arab countries who also have an interest in fighting such acts.

Otherwise, referring to his trip to the FRG, the prime minister viewed it as a useful working visit and added that he had discussed international policy and Portuguese-German bilateral relations with Helmut Kohl and with German government officials. Cavaco Silva also had meetings with German businessmen regarding incentives for them to invest in Portugal.

With regard to Portuguese emigrants, he revealed that the government has drawn up a budget allocation which will be published shortly which envisions the creation of credit facilities for our compatriots and permits wider control of any possible frauds.

On the subject of EEC funds for Portugal, the prime minister said the meetings held with the FRG Government lead him to conclude that the community should comply and implement financial assistance soon. Professor Cavaco Silva added that the EEC authorities should be considering funds for regional development, professional training, job creation schemes, and commercial and industrial enterprises.

Remarks on Libya; Tripoli Envoy

LD180229 Lisbon Domestic Service in Portuguese 2230 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Excerpts] The U.S.-Libyan conflict is still in the headlines. The Portuguese Foreign Ministry is recalling the head of its diplomatic mission in Tripoli to Lisbon.

Portuguese Prime Minister Cavaco Silva, who returned to Lisbon this afternoon after an official visit to the FRG, made very clear the position of the Lisbon government:

[Begin Cavaco Silva recording] The Portuguese Government supported the decision made at the meeting of foreign ministers in The Hague which counseled against the use of force, but very vehemently condemned terrorism. That is our position. We think that countries should develop their efforts jointly to fight terrorism. The Americans were the ones to be most affected recently in these acts of terrorism, which places governments, in this case the U.S. Government, under great pressure and (has resulted in) an attack on Libya. We do not agree with this procedure; however, we cannot ignore the reality that American subjects have died in acts of terrorism.

We continue to consider that wide-ranging political efforts should be developed, including not only the EEC countries but also other European countries, and meetings with Arab countries that have an interest in fighting acts of terrorism should be developed. [end recording]

Shortly after his return to Lisbon, Cavaco Silva went to Belem Palace to meet with President of the Republic Mario Soares. After the meeting, the prime minister spoke to journalists and emphasized that the agreement for the use of Lajes Base by the United States came within the NATO sphere. In the event of a hypothetical request by the United States to use the base in the conflict with Libya, Cavaco Silva confined himself to saying that he did not comment on hypotheses.

DEMONSTRATORS PROTEST AT U.S. EMBASSY OVER RAID

LD172335 Lisbon Domestic Service in Portuguese 2100 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] Nearly 400 demonstrators gathered this evening outside the U.S. Embassy in Lisbon to protest the U.S. military intervention in Libya. The demonstration was authorized by (?the civil authorities) and passed off without incident. They shouted slogans condemning the U.S. raid and in favor of the principle of dialogue and negotiation in international relations. The demonstration was called by the Portuguese Council for Peace and Cooperation and was supported by the unions, workers' commissions and other organizations.

POLITICAL PARTIES REACT TO U.S. RAID ON LIBYA

LD152312 Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish 1700 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Text] We now look at the reaction of the political forces in our country, most of which are critical of the U.S. military action against Libya, the exception to this being the Popular Alliance.

The Popular Alliance praised the U.S. attack because it believed that it was a legitimate defense. It said that the United States fulfilled its duty as a rightful leader and deserved the recognition of all those who desire world peace. Oscar Alzaga [of the Popular Alliance's coalition partner Popular Democratic Party], however, described the U.S. military initiative as "disproportionate."

The PSOE did not support the act of force carried out against Libya and believed that this was not the right way to combat terrorism. The Socialists called for recourse to diplomatic channels for a solution to the conflict, and hoped that the effort of the EEC could prevent a military escalation in the Mediterranean.

The Civic Platform [for Spain's Withdrawal From NATO] asked the Spanish Government for a ban on the use of the U.S. bases on our territory and the cancellation of the Spanish-U.S. military agreement. It also demanded the immobilization of the U.S. F-111 aircraft that landed at Rota and asked the government to promote a conference on peace in the Mediterranean to include the countries of the region and the USSR and United States as observers.

All the Basque political parties -- the Basque Nationalist Party, Euskadiko Ezkerra [Basque Left] and Herri Batasuna [Popular Unity -- radical leftwing coalition] -- have expressed their rejection of the U.S. military action in the Mediterranean.

Gerardo Iglesias, PCE secretary general, said that Spain was implicated in the U.S. criminal attack on Libya, an attack which proved the subordination of Spain and the other countries of the Common Market to the militaristic interests of the Reagan administration.

Rodríguez Sahagun of the Democratic and Social Center said that Europe and the United States cannot be the slaves and servants of the United States [sentence as heard]. The Reformists of Miguél Eaca said that the origin of the conflict is to be found in Colonel al-Qadhafi, but the U.S. action is disproportionate.

DEMONSTRATIONS PROTEST U.S. ATTACK ON LIBYA

LD151936 Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish 1800 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Summary] Several Spanish cities are the scene of demonstrations protesting the U.S. attack on Libya. The Civic Platform, the anti-NATO committees, and various leftwing organizations are staging a protest demonstration outside the U.S. Embassy in Madrid. Some 800 mostly young people also have demonstrated outside the U.S. Consulate in Barcelona where trade unions issued a statement strongly condemning the U.S. attack on Libya. All but one of the eight people who were arrested at an earlier demonstration outside the U.S. Consulate in Barcelona today have been released.

At U.S. Military Bases

PA162258 Madrid EFE in Spanish 2221 GMT 16 Apr 86

[Excerpt] Madrid, 16 Apr (EFE) -- Demonstrations against the U.S. military intervention in Libya today took place in several Spanish cities, particularly in cities close to some of the four U.S. military bases in Spain. The main demonstration, which gathered several thousand demonstrators, took place in Madrid and was called by the Anti-NATO Platform [Plataforma Anti-NATO] under the slogan of "For peace in the Mediterranean, Spain's neutrality, and against the U.S. bases." The Platform demanded a statement from the Spanish Government on the situation in the Mediterranean, an express ban on the use of U.S. military bases in Spain, and the cancellation of the bilateral treaty with the United States.

Demonstrations were held in other Spanish cities for the same reason and most involved several hundred participants. Some clashes with the police took place at the end of the demonstrations.

500 Demonstrate in Zaragoza

LD162043 Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish 1800 GMT 16 Apr 86

[Summary] Dispatch from Zaragoza: Some 500 people have gathered in the Plaza de Espana in Zaragoza to protest the U.S. military action against Libya. The demonstration has been organized by peace groups, leftwing parties and trade unions, and prior to it a statement was handed in at the Cortes Aragonesas calling for the dismantling of the Zaragoza air base. The demonstration has not been authorized by the Office of the Civil Governor.

Further on Mass Protests

LD162311 Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish 2226 GMT 16 Apr 86

[Summary] Today, Wednesday, there have been further demonstrations in Spain protesting the U.S. action against Libya. In Zaragoza some 1,000 people erected barricades and threw stones at the police, who charged the demonstrators several times and also used smoke canisters and rubber bullets to disperse them. Police sources said that at least six policemen and possibly more demonstrators were injured in the incidents, which continued until 2200.

In Seville, some 500 people demonstrated outside the U.S. Consulate, but were dispersed after some groups began to throw stones at the building. American flags were burned and barricades erected in Bilbao and San Sebastian, where 2,000 people demonstrated outside the Offices of the Civil Governors.

In Madrid, between 5,000 and 20,000 people -- according to the information given by the Office of the Government Delegate or the organizers -- supported the call from the Civic Platform for peace in the Mediterranean and against the U.S. bases in Spain. The demonstration took place without incident.

Protests Continue for 3d Day

LD171938 Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish 1800 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Summary] For the 3d day running there have been protests in the streets of Madrid against the U.S. military action against Libya. The demonstration, which is taking place now, was called by the Anti-NATO commission and various leftwing trade unions and organizations. Several thousand people are taking part in the demonstration under the slogan "Against Yankee aggression on Libya," for peace in the Mediterranean and the dismantling of the bases. The demonstrators are protesting the Spanish Government's failure to condemn the U.S. attack, the landing of a U.S. F-111 plane at the Rota base and the refuelling of U.S. ships at Spanish bases, and are demanding the immediate renunciation of the bilateral treaty between Spain and the United States. The demonstration is going ahead without incident, although the police presence is noticeable, particularly in the vicinity of the Foreign Ministry.

IBERIA, LUFTHANSA CANCEL TRIPOLI FLIGHTS

LD172100 Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish 1600 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] Iberia and Lufthansa have cancelled their flights to Tripoli from Madrid and Frankfurt, respectively, due to alleged difficulties in Libyan air space.

SPANISH TU ASKS CANCELLATION OF SHIPPING TO LIBYA

LD172308 Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish 1900 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] The Spanish merchant navy officers trade union has asked the Foreign Ministry to cancel all Spanish shipping to Libyan ports because of the situation which has arisen in the area as a result of the Libyan-U.S. conflict. In the view of this union, there is no sufficient guarantee of the safety of the crews under these circumstances if shipping to Libya is maintained.

LEADERS, PAPERS REACT TO ATTACK ON LIBYA

PM171316 [Editorial Report] Nordic newspapers for 16 April carry comment on and reaction to the U.S. military action against Libya. Copenhagen's AKTUELT in its page 10 editorial calls the action a "slap in the face for the U.S. friends in Western Europe" and "political and moral defeat for the Americans." The paper concludes with the assessment: "Reagan's North African crusade has made the gap between the United States and Western Europe greater. It has endangered the East-West dialogue. It has driven the Arab world into flocking to support Al-Qadhafi -- including the moderate Arab states, that are so necessary to the Middle East dialogue. Detente, the cohesion of the Western Alliance and the peace process in the Middle East were also hit by the bombs yesterday morning. Western Europe must speak out clearly and unambiguously against Reagan's dangerous course."

In two page 17 articles Ole Lorenzen and Jens-Jorgen Krogh report on Danish political reaction. AKTUELT notes Social Democratic Party Chairman Anker Jorgensen's comments. Jorgensen calls the U.S. action "state terrorism and in direct conflict with the UN Charter" and adds: "It is impossible to dissociate oneself strongly enough from and condemn what has happened." Despite an official Danish Foreign Ministry statement dissociating Denmark from the action, AKTUELT reports, Jorgensen also says that his party will consider raising the matter of a formal Danish protest in the Folketing.

Radical Liberal leader Ole Vig Jensen says that U.S. indignation over recent terrorist activity "cannot legalize the U.S. behavior." "Violence cannot be combated with violence," he adds. And Socialist People's Party leader Gert Petersen describes the action as a "demonstration of U.S. military power to frighten those states which will not dance to Reagan's tune."

Stockholm's DAGENS NYHETER in its page 2 editorial writes: "The U.S. air attack against Libya must be condemned most strongly. The world community should never become used to acts of war being used to get at the perpetrators of terrorist acts."

Reviewing the background to the action, the paper shows sympathy with the United States as a result the lack of response from Europe to calls for sanctions, and concludes: "When, for example, Foreign Minister Sten Andersson stresses that we cannot accept acts of war, this must be reasonably taken to mean a Swedish commitment to participate in a broad peaceful fight against terrorism. Al-Qadhafi and his brothers in violence need to be stopped. The United States should not be left alone and locked in a frightening alternative of violence, where the law of brute force replaces international law."

In a page 8 unattributed report DAGENS NYHETER quotes Foreign Minister Andersson's 15 April statement which asserts that "the U.S. action goes against international law" and continues: "The government takes a very serious view of what has happened. Recent events have created a dangerous situation in the Mediterranean region and run the risk of having profound repercussions." The statement ends with a "definite call to the states involved to show restraint and seek through diplomatic channels to settle the conflict that has arisen."

A page 8 Kaa Eneberg Moscow dispatch also notes the following comment by Prime Minister Carlsson at a press conference at the Swedish Embassy: "We view this as a very serious situation. Terrorism must be condemned and combated, but violence never solves any problems in the long run. We therefore call for self-control."

SWEDENCARLSSON SEES 'PROMISING SIGN' IN SOVIET VIEW

LD172232 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 2000 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson returned to Sweden this evening after his 4-day visit to Moscow. He said the willingness of the Soviet leadership to respect the Swedish policy of neutrality was expressed more clearly than earlier and, according to the prime minister this is a promising sign. In connection with Ingvar Carlsson's visit to the Soviet Union, several trade contracts were concluded between the Soviet Union and Swedish enterprises. The total value of the contracts is 600 million kronor, 470 of which includes Swedish exports to the Soviet Union.

PAPER PREFERS LIBYA BOYCOTT TO MILITARY ACTION

PM171346 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 15 Apr 86 p 2

[Editorial: "Al-Qadhafi and Europe"]

[Excerpt] Of course, there is no reason to feel sorry for Mu'ammarr al-Qadhafi. No other national leader deserves so much the description "gangster." Regardless of the state of evidence regarding terrorist individual acts his list of merits is without the slightest doubt bloodstained. On several occasions he has even boasted of his dreadful exploits.

But international terrorism is a hydra with many heads, and against this background the obsessiveness with which the Reagan administration is trying to get at Al-Qadhafi seems strange. Terrorism has other sponsors too. Behind the past months' misdeeds in Western Europe and the Mediterranean region threads can be seen which seem to lead to Libya, but there are also threads which could lead to Syria and to Iran.

After the bombings at the New Year at Rome and Vienna airports the finger was primarily pointed at Al-Qadhafi. But it was Palestinian terrorist leader Abu Nidal who assumed responsibility for the deeds. The latter has his headquarters in Damascus and is clearly operating with the Syrian Government's approval.

However, because of its policy in the Middle East the United States needs to maintain a diplomatic modus vivendi toward Syria and therefore ignores Syrian involvement in terrorism. There is a certain double standard in U.S. behavior.

That the U.S. European allies should dissociate themselves from the idea of U.S. military action against Libya is wholly understandable. However, it is more difficult to understand why up to now the West European governments have rejected all hints from Washington for a diplomatic and economic boycott of Libya. Such a boycott would be fully justified and would, if it were implemented with solidarity, be effective, for nowadays Libya is economically vulnerable. In addition European participation in a boycott would reduce the risk of military adventures on the part of the United States.

'STORMY EXCHANGES' IN PARLIAMENT ON AL-QADHDHAFI

LD171918 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1509 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] The prime minister today rejected the charge that Colonel al-Qadhafi's support had been boosted by the British-backed U.S. air strike in Libya. During stormy exchanges in prime minister's question time, Mrs Thatcher insisted: "I do not believe the reputation of Colonel al-Qadhafi has been enhanced. If you let the threat of further terrorism prevent you from fighting against it then the terrorist has won and he will hold you to ransom."

But spearheading further angry condemnation of her decision to allow the use of British bases, opposition leader Mr Neil Kinnock accused Mrs Thatcher: "You provoke terrorism".

And Liberal leader Mr David Steel demanded that she should "now accept your share of personal responsibility for the boosting of Colonel al-Qadhafi's political support as we saw on the streets of Tripoli last night".

KINNOCK BLAMES THATCHER FOR DEATHS OF HOSTAGES

LD181216 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1000 GMT 18 Apr 86

[By David Bradshaw, PA Political Staff]

[Excerpt] Labour leader Mr Neil Kinnock today accused the prime minister of putting "helpless people" in the front line against terrorism. He said: "She said yesterday she was standing up to terrorism. I think the tragic evidence is it is others -- helpless people -- who have been left to stand up to terrorism." Speaking in London, Mr Kinnock said: "I consider the prime minister, by her complicity in President Reagan's actions, left kidnapped British citizens to their fate and has intensified the jeopardy of other people in the Middle East area."

Mr Kinnock accused the government of having a "rather casual" attitude to security. "Since Tuesday I have been calling for a major increase in security cover for people working and travelling in Middle Eastern countries and that must now receive urgent attention. I believe that the government's approach for some time past has been rather casual. It is also necessary to step up security in Britain and to exercise increased vigilance."

Interviewed later by ITN, Mr Kinnock denied he had ever said that Mrs Thatcher had been left "with blood on her hands" over the deaths. He said: "I think that is a melodramatic statement and I never made such a statement. I do think the prime minister did not give sufficient attention to the implications for hostages and I do believe she abandoned people to their fate."

OPPOSITION SPOKESMAN: U.S. ATTACK 'IRRATIONAL'

LD180939 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 0752 GMT 18 Apr 86

[Excerpts] A shadow minister today claimed the government knew that the result of its involvement in the United States bombing raid on Libya would "almost certainly mean the deaths" of British hostages in the Middle East. Mr Donald Anderson, a Labour front bench spokesman on foreign affairs, said Britain's role instead should be "to turn Libya into an international leper."

"Mrs Thatcher has certainly put our people in the front line by totally identifying with the United States' policy and being almost alone in that," he said. "Sadly the first victims are those three British citizens in the Lebanon."

Mr Anderson said on BBC breakfast television that the United States had attacked terrorism in an irrational way. "We have got to work out the consequences of any action and we believe the effect the raid on Libya will have will be to increase rather than decrease terrorism. "What we have to do is to turn Libya into an international leper rather than turn Colonel al-Qadhafi into a hero in his own country and in the Arab world as well."

Mr Anderson said diplomatic and economic pressure was far more likely to succeed than meeting state terror with state terror. "There should be a whole range of policies in the personal, diplomatic and economic sphere rather than all this irrational violence which may have helped American domestic opinion, but has certainly harmed our people. The result was predicted, is predictable and has isolated us in the world, and in our view, will increase the dangers of terrorism."

PAPER SEEKS 'ILLUMINATION' ON FUTURE USE OF BASES

PM171501 London DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 17 Apr 86 p 18

[Editorial: "Their Bases Here"]

[Text] There can be no reliable reckoning yet on the political consequences for us of President Reagan's raid on Libya. The immediate public response has been disapproving. Depending on events, that mood may change. But, duty towards America discharged, the government's task, only begun in yesterday's debate, lies fundamentally in the need for public reassurance. On this mission ministers must strike the right targets or, more appositely, fill the right bomb holes. Deepest misgivings about this attack will not be met by uncovering more proof of Col al-Qadhafi's guilt. Both the President and the prime minister yesterday have established that. It is not the issue preoccupying anxious minds. A sharper doubt arises on whether bombs on Tripoli can halt a despot's campaign of terrorism. That doubt will only be settled by events, which may already be turning. And to deal with one other subsidiary issue, there is no run in the conjecture that the prime minister, acting in conjunction with the President, and repaying Falklands debts acted without proper consultation with her ministers.

Much nearer home, and in the longer term more serious, is the sudden awareness that America's bases in this country are there for serious business. This agreement with America, first reached between President Truman and Mr Attlee more than 30 years ago (when weapons were different) has lain dormant. In the sudden awakening to its implications some people sense a nightmare. In the short term Mrs Thatcher made the essential points yesterday. Our agreement was necessary. It was, in this instance, restricted to "clearly defined targets related to terrorism." For any future course of action, requiring these bases, we have reserved our position.

That is reassuring, as far as it goes; but it will not, we think, be allowed to rest there. During a long period of relative peace in Europe, few have been moved to inquire too deeply into the precise nature of our understanding with America, whose contribution to NATO has done most to preserve the peace. The issue in many minds is not whether these bases were or were not indispensable to America in this instance; but to what use in any future contingency our particular arrangements might be put. That is the area which ministers, in the task of public reassurance, would be wise to illuminate.

ANTITERRORIST BRANCH NAMES BOMB SUSPECT

LD171813 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1639 GMT 17 Apr 86

[By John Jenkin and Roger Williams, PA staff reporters]

[Excerpt] An Arab terrorist plot to blow up an Israeli airliner flying from Heathrow airport with 400 passengers was foiled today. And tonight, a huge manhunt was taking place for the Arab who "duped" his Irish-born girlfriend into carrying a holdall containing nearly 10 lb of explosives designed to blow up in flight.

Disaster was averted by El Al security staff who discovered the device during a routine security check 35 minutes before the jet was due to take off for Tel Aviv.

Commander George Churchill-Coleman, head of the anti-terrorist branch, said: "It is highly likely such an explosion would have resulted in the loss of the aircraft, a Boeing 747 jumbo jet, and the 400 passengers and crew." The commander named the man police believe is behind the bomb plot as Nezar Hindawi, who is 35-years old, clean-shave, 5 ft 10 in tall with black curly hair greying at the sides. He is believed to have dropped off the girl with the holdall at the airport this morning, leaving her "in all innocence" to board the aircraft and suffer the same fate as the others, said Mr Churchill-Coleman. He added that there was "a very real possibility" she had been duped into carrying the bomb. The commander said the woman, who was still being interviewed, was single and lived and worked in London at a hotel. She had met Hindawi in London and they had known each other about 12 months. She was on her way to Tel Aviv for a holiday in Israel with the holdall which belonged to her.

WORKERS IN LIBYA SAFE, KEEP 'LOW PROFILE'

PM161211 London DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 16 Apr 86 p 4

[A.J. McIlroy report: "Workforce of 5,000 Britons Sits Tight"]

[Excerpts] A well tried "home guard" system of telephone calls between community leaders produced no reports yesterday of British casualties in the air strikes on Libyan targets. The estimated 5,000 Britons were keeping a low profile, most staying in their homes and others doing little work in offices and on contract sites.

The Coventry-based tractor manufacturer Massey-Ferguson has 11 Britons in Tajura, 20 miles from Tripoli, advising Libyans on tractor assembly. They are working normally, a spokesman said. A Plessey spokesman said the company's four employees in Libya were "safe" GEC said its eight people were working normally, and another British firm, Marconi Communications, said its small expatriate staff was well.

The small contingents of British experts with Plessey, RACAL Communications, GEC and Pye-Unicom make it almost certain that the radar equipment used to track the American fighter-bombers, and to programme the weapons used against them, had been installed and calibrated by British technicians.

The British Government plays down the importance of the continuing trade with Libya. In 1985, Britain exported 238 million pounds in goods (mainly machinery and transport equipment, chemicals and manufactured goods) to Libya and imported 311 million pounds (mainly oil). This compares with the peak year for exports, 1981, when goods sold totalled 528 million pounds.

HOWE CONDEMNS MURDER OF HOSTAGES IN BEIRUT

LD181236 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1124 GMT 18 Apr 86

[Text] Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe today condemned the murder of two British teachers in Beirut and also expressed "deepest sorrow."

In a statement, he said: "I have learned with shock and horror of the murder in Lebanon today of two British citizens Mr Leigh Douglas and Mr Philip Padfield who were kidnapped on 28 March this year. The deaths of these two innocent subjects cause me, the prime minister and the whole British government the deepest sorrow. Our heartfelt sympathies go to their families. Both men have given many years of service to the Arab community teaching in Lebanon. This is a senseless outrage for which there can be no justification of any kind. I utterly condemn it.

"For some time we have had firm evidence of direct Libyan involvement in the kidnapping of Mr Douglas and Mr Padfield and had good reason to believe they were in Libyan hands.

"We have of course been conscious throughout of the great danger they were in. Although we decided not to publicise it, because of the risk to their lives, this was part of the evidence we had before us of Libyan state-directed terrorism.

"I am deeply anguished at the continuing uncertainty over the fate of Mr Collett and Mr McCarthy."

Mr Alec Collett is believed to have been the third victim whose body was found yesterday. Mr John McCarthy, a TV agency journalist, was kidnapped in Beirut yesterday morning.

USSR'S KARPOV IN LONDON FOR DISARMAMENT TALKS

LD181038 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1016 GMT 18 Apr 86

[Text] Moscow's condemnation of Britain's role in the U.S. raid on Libya is apparently not being allowed to interfere with Soviet Leader Mr Mikhail Gorbachev's drive for progress in arms control. Talks were taking place in London today between senior British and Soviet officials on arms control issues, the Foreign Office confirmed. Mr Victor Karpov, chief Soviet negotiator at the bilateral talks with the U.S. in Geneva, arrived in London this week for talks with Mr Tim Daunt, a senior Foreign Office official responsible for defence and disarmament. The Foreign Office emphasised that Britain's nuclear deterrent would not be a subject for discussion.

Mr Karpov was making a courtesy call on Mr Tim Renton, the minister responsible for East-West relations. The talks were arranged after Mrs Thatcher's reply a few months ago to Mr Gorbachev's demand that the British and French nuclear deterrents should be included in the Geneva arms control talks. The prime minister rejected the inclusion of the British deterrent in these talks, but said Britain would be ready to have talks at official level on other arms control issues. A Foreign Office spokesman said today's talks were the outcome.

Two days ago Britain's ambassador in Moscow, Sir Bryan Cartledge, was summoned to the Soviet Foreign Ministry to hear a strong protest at Britain's involvement in the Libyan raid. Sir Bryan rejected the allegations.

Observers today saw the arrival of Mr Karpov in London as a possible indication that a new frost was not necessarily going to fall on Anglo-Soviet relations, as might have been expected after the attack on Libya.

UK BASES ON ALERT; POSSIBLE EVACUATION SEEN

NC180855 Nicosia 0 FILELEVTHEROS in Greek 18 Apr 86 p 1

[Excerpts] British bases in Cyprus have been on a state of alert since yesterday, within the framework of a possible evacuation of Britons from Beirut.

This was reported by REUTERS, quoting British military authorities. British officials however, were unable to confirm these reports yesterday.

Our Limassol correspondent reports that increased security measures have been observed on the British bases in the last few days, with strong military patrols operating in the area of Akrotiri and Episkopi. Patrols in the residential areas of the base have been significantly more frequent than usual.

These measures were implemented by the British authorities after the U.S. attack on Libya and the resulting threat that British targets would be hit "because Britain helped the Americans."

At the same time, it has been observed that the presence of Britons in Limassol is very limited, particularly at night.

ARAB MISSIONS ISSUE WARNING OVER UK BASES

NC170855 Nicosia I SINERINI in Greek 17 Apr 86 p 3

[Text] "The heads of Arab diplomatic missions in Cyprus have drawn the government's attention to possible dangers -- inherent in the presence of British bases in Cyprus -- for the countries and the inhabitants of the surrounding region.

"We also express the hope that the government will undertake an initiative for the removal of these bases so that Cyprus can become the source of aid to neighboring countries, instead of making its territory available for launching attacks against them."

This was part of a statement yesterday by the heads of Arab missions in Cyprus, resulting from the recent U.S. attack on Libya. The statement emphasized that "the barbaric U.S. behavior was not only directed against Libyan people but goes far beyond in an effort to intimidate the entire Arab nation and the inhabitants of the surrounding area, as well as the inhabitants of Cyprus."

The statement also called on "all friendly governments and all those who love peace, including the friendly country of Cyprus, to condemn the U.S. attack on Libya and to adopt all necessary measures to stop it."

In addition, it expressed thanks for the organization of a demonstration of solidarity towards Libya, which was staged in Nicosia the other day.

DAILY QUESTIONS EFFECT OF U.S. ACTION IN LIBYA

NC170850 Nicosia 0 FILELEVTHEROS in Greek 17 Apr 86 p 3

[From the "Liberal" column: "We Are Not Happy"]

[Text] We are glad that British bases in Cyprus were not used in the U.S. attack against Libya.

In the past we have said that, while the bases are sovereign British territory according to the agreements establishing the Cyprus Republic, they do not cease to be part of the island of Cyprus, which is also our fatherland. As a result, there are no grounds for the allegation that we have no say over something that is not ours or does not belong to us. We do have a say about what is happening on the bases and we have a right to refuse when the conditions for use of the bases are being violated.

With respect to the U.S. attack against Libya, we must say that we are not at all happy about what took place. No reasonable men can support terrorism, which victimizes innocent people and which can achieve nothing positive. Terrorism has never helped the struggle of nations. At the same time, however, we do not believe that suspected terrorists can be dealt with in the manner attempted by the U.S. Administration in its handling of the Al-Qadhdhafi government, which it considers responsible for acts of terrorism in various parts of the world.

Is the United States certain that it will be able to uproot international terrorism with its military operation against Libya? We fear it will not. We, together with many other people in many countries, have our doubts.

The United Nations has dealt with the matter of terrorism and the countries, each according to its ability, did adopt certain measures to deal with it. There is a strong basis to the opinion expressed by many politicians from various countries that international terrorism cannot be dealt with in the manner attempted by the United States. Proof of this can be found in the new U.S. and British headache, which is forcing them to take stringest security measures to protect their citizens, installations, and leaders.

There must be an answer to the question: Why have acts of terrorism increased over the past few decades? The answer is easy: Acts of violence are, most certainly, acts of desperation that are born when injustice is seen reigning supreme, without any end in sight. This is another result of the great gap that separates eloquent declarations from deeds, which separates theory from practice.

CSSR AMBASSADOR DISCUSSES BILATERAL RELATIONS

NC160942 Nicosia O FILELEVTHEROS in Greek 16 Apr 86 p 12

[Text] "We must increase the involvement of both local and international interests in the Cyprus issue. Cyprus must exploit the wide support offered by progressive humanity."

This was emphasized yesterday by Ladislav Skerik, the Czechoslovak ambassador to Cyprus, during a news conference on the 41st anniversary of the victory against fascism and the liberation of Czechoslovakia.

Skerik stressed: "We know very well the importance of guarantees -- which countries offer guarantees and what, exactly, are their obligations."

Voicing support for the Soviet proposals on the Cyprus issue, the Czechoslovak ambassador said that the foreign aspects of the problem could be solved through an international conference.

He reiterated his country's strong support for the struggle of Cyprus and stressed, "We will continue to support all measures through the United Nations for the purpose of preserving the independence, unity, territorial integrity, and nonaligned character of Cyprus."

Skerik said that both political and economic relations between Czechoslovakia and Cyprus are excellent and good examples for emulation.

Replying to questions by newsmen, the Czechoslovak ambassador said:

- Trade would be expanded as a result of the visit to Czechoslovakia by Mikhail Mikhaïlidhis, Cyprus minister of commerce and industry. During 1985, exchanges amounted to \$7 million in exports to Cyprus and \$4.5 million in imports from Cyprus.
- Czechoslovakia will build its own embassy and a trade center in Nicosia, plus a large tourist hotel that will house Czechoslovak tourists.
- Czechoslovakia strongly condemns the U.S. attack against Libya and warns that another step nearer to war was taken as a result of this attack.

The news conference was also attended by Vitezlav Dosek, the Czechoslovak Embassy's commercial counsellor and by (Sveita), the embassy's second secretary.

KIPRIANOU RETURNS FROM CONSULTATIONS IN GREECE

NC151818 Nicosia Domestic Service in Greek 1630 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Excerpt] President Kiprianou returned this evening from Athens, where he discussed the latest developments in the Cyprus issue with Prime Minister Andreas Papandreu and Greek party leaders. The president was welcomed at Larnaca Airport by Vasos Lissaridhis, president of the House of Representatives, who had been acting as his deputy, members of the Ministerial Council, and other officials. At noon today Kiprianou met with the president of Greece, Khriston Sartzetakis, during which various aspects of the Cyprus problem were discussed.

TURKISH CYPRIOT PARTIES CONDEMN U.S. OPERATION

TA151111 (Clandestine) Bayrak Radio in Turkish to Cyprus 1030 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Text] The Republic Turkish Party has condemned the U.S. attack on nonaligned Libya and expressed its full support of and solidarity with the Libyan people. Party leader Ozker Ozgur pointed out that the United States had no qualms about barbarically using aggressive state terrorism against small and nonaligned Libya, ignoring international law. He stressed that the U.S. technological and military power cannot frighten the nonaligned countries.

The Communal Liberation Party [CLP] strongly denounced U.S. President Reagan, other U.S. leaders, and the Thatcher government that helped them. The CLP said it shares the suffering of the Libyan people. CLP leader Ismail Bozkurt pointed out that responding to terrorism with terrorism is no solution, adding that it is the shameful incident of our times when such civilized and freedom-loving people as the Americans applaud state terrorism led by the Reagan administration.

The Progressive People's Party said it is opposed to the use of Cyprus as a stepping-stone for any attack. It stressed that the British Government and the Greek Cypriot Government have no right to allow attacks against Libya or any other state from the Akrotiri and Dhekelia bases. A party official, Ismet Kotak, pointed out that these bases are included in the 1960 Cyprus agreements and the Turkish Cypriot people have a definite right of decision on these bases.

The Social Democratic Party protested the U.S. attack against Libya and said that all the institutions of the Turkish republic of Northern Cyprus must condemn the U.S. attack. Party Secretary General Hasan Nesipoglu said that the United States is endangering security in the Mediterranean, undermining world peace, and staining human history.

Further Report

TA151630 (Clandestine) Bayrak Radio in Turkish to Cyprus 1530 GMT 15 Apr 86

[Text] A statement by the National Unity Party [NUP] strongly condemns the armed attack carried out by the United States against the Libyan people with the excuse of combating terrorism. The statement signed by NUP Secretary General Olgun Pasalar says that the party opposes all kind of war provocations, adding that the NUP is concerned and worried over this stand, which threatens world and regional peace. The statement calls on U.S. officials as well as the Libyans to act with calm and common sense, stressing that the NUP shares the pain of the brotherly Libyan people.

Meanwhile, a statement by the New Birth Party says that no excuse can be used to justify the crime committed against the Libyan people by the U.S. bombing before the eyes of the whole world. It adds that no country has the right to attack another so thoughtlessly, pointing out that this has proved that the time is ripe for all Islamic countries to unite. The statement signed by party Secretary General Aytac Besler, concludes that they do not condone this act by the United States.

The Cypriot Democracy Party statement says that the U.S. attack against Libya violates international law and UN principles. The statement adds that this incident proves that there is no difference between the superpowers in acting contrary to world peace and the rule of law, pointing out that international problems must be solved through peaceful means. The statement, signed by party Secretary General Ekrem Ural, concludes by protesting against the United States.

GREEK FORCES ON ALERT NEAR U.S. MILITARY BASES

NC172043 Athens ATHENS NEWS in English 17 Apr 86 p 3

[Text] Greek Air Force planes and naval units have intensified patrols around Crete and the southern extensions of the FIR [as published] of Athens since early Tuesday morning. These defensive measures were taken soon after it was learned of the American attacks on Libya targets. At the same time, defense was raised to maximum in those areas of the country in which NATO or American bases are located. This elevated defensive posture includes the facilities of the giant "Voice of America" radio station at Dhasoton between Kavala and Xanthi. The national road between Xrisoupolis and Xanthi is being guarded by police vehicles, which [as published] employees of the radio station are "escorted" to their jobs and back to their homes by police. Other police forces are guarding the second "Voice of America" station at Aylasma of the Nestos Potamos, which receives the service's main broadcasts from Greenville, North Carolina.

The full security alert is a results of Tuesday morning's U.S. air strikes against Libyan targets in retaliation for what it calls "act of terrorism" which include the recent TWA explosion over Greece which killed four Americans, including a 1-year-old baby.

LIBYAN OFFICIAL BRINGS MESSAGE FROM AL-QADHDHAFI

NC171851 Athens Domestic Service in Greek 1800 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] Ahmad Shahati, Libyan deputy foreign minister and secretary general of the Mediterranean Socialist Parties Association, arrived in Athens this evening. The Libyan official will have talks with Foreign Minister Karolos Papoulias early tonight.

According to press reports, Shahati is bringing a personal message from Libyan leader Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi to the Greek Government. Papoulias has already stated that whether Shahati meets with Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou will depend on how the talks go. The Greek foreign minister added that there may be further discussions tomorrow at the Foreign Ministry.

LIBYAN ENVOY ON U.S. RAID, EUROPE'S ROLE

NC172033 Athens RIZOSPASTIS in Greek 17 Apr 86 p 3

[Text] Washington has created a war situation in the Mediterranean. It is not as if there had been one, two, or even three attacks against Libya, then an end to the matter. I would describe this as a war declared by the United States with the aim of destroying the Libyan people. There is great danger that it could escalate, with serious consequences for all the people of the Mediterranean. This war will have more general repercussions on the Arab world's relations with the United States and Europe.

This was stated yesterday by Libyan Ambassador in Athens 'Abdallah Abu Mahara at a press conference, which was attended by (Milhim Hayas), director of the office of the Association of Arab States in Athens.

The U.S. military attack against innocent civilians in Libya, the ambassador stressed, was carried out in coordination with certain West European governments.

The most blatant case is that of the British Government, which to all intents and purposes participated in the war against Libya. We are at war, the ambassador said. "The Libyan Jamahiriyah announces to the United States that it will resist. We shall fight standing up and be killed like martyrs, or go on until the aggression ends and those who planned it are punished. We shall return the blow by striking at military targets that made the aggression possible. It is not a matter of 'European targets' but of military targets. This might not happen in Europe. It might take place against the Americans."

The Libyan ambassador disclosed that the bomb attack on a West Berlin discotheque (which the U.S. Government used as an excuse for launching its barbaric raid on Libya) was the work of the U.S. services. The explosion, he stressed, was one of Washington's provocative ways of "forming" and preparing international public opinion before launching attack. The biggest proof of this is the fact that even official Bonn did not dare speak of a "Libyan involvement" in the bomb attack. The U.S. Government, meanwhile, did not offer any "proof" -- because naturally there is none.

The various kinds of pressure that Washington brought to bear on its European allies so that they would take a specific stand against Libya, the ambassador stressed, were "based on provocative methods and flimsy pretexts." The attitude adopted by the EEC was, the ambassador said in reply to a question, the result of this pressure. "The hysterical anti-Libyan campaign that West Europe launched after the EEC meeting in The Hague prepared the ground for the implementation of the U.S. terrorist plans against our people."

Asked which European governments other than the British had cooperated in the U.S. attack, the ambassador said that all those who had helped make the aggression possible would be revealed in due course. He added: "You have followed international reaction, and you should know which states abetted the attack. It will go down as a black day in their history." In another part of the interview he said, in connection with the West German Government: "We are very sorry that it did not take into consideration its relations with the Arab world or its political and economic links with the Libyan Jamahiriyah. It succumbed to U.S. imperialist pressures and gave in to Reagan's demands."

The Libyan ambassador said that Greece's reaction to the attack had been positive and was very different from those of the other Western countries. He expressed his country's gratitude for the Greek people's militant solidarity with the suffering people of Libya.

"Libya has not threatened Greece," he said. "Although there are U.S. bases on Greek soil, we are sure that the people and the Government of Greece will not allow them to be used against our country."

Regarding the strike against the U.S. base on the Italian island of Lampedusa, he pointed out that this operation was undertaken because the facilities on the base had contributed to the U.S. attack.

"We have always denounced terrorism and we oppose it in any form," the Libyan ambassador stressed. "We have been the victims of terrorism from the moment we won our independence and freedom. International public opinion has warmly supported Libya in defending itself and repulsing the barbaric U.S. attack. All peace-loving states have a duty to support us in our struggle."

In reply to a question, he said that the Soviet Union is pressuring Washington in many ways to stop its aggression. The USSR is trying to handle the situation in such a way as to prevent the escalation of the war.

We have not asked anyone, he said, to fight for us. So far we have not asked the USSR to intervene militarily. We do not want the war to escalate into a military confrontation between the United States and the USSR, because the consequences of such an event will be disastrous.

It is our affair, he added, to decide whether to cooperate with the Warsaw Pact. "It will depend on how far we have to go to protect our lives and rights." Finally, he said that the attack against Libya and Arab solidarity are creating possibilities for a new "Arab awakening" against imperialism. The current situation, he stressed, is reminiscent of developments in the Arab world after the imperialist attack on Egypt in 1956.

KIPRIANOU, PAPANDEOU VIEW CYPRUS ISSUES

NC161226 Nicosia I SIMERINI in Greek 16 Apr 86 p 14

[Report by unidentified special correspondent:]

[Text] Athens, 15 Apr -- Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreu has told the president of Cyprus clearly that both the convocation of an all-national conference in Athens and the creation of a Cypriot government of national unity depend upon Cypriot politicians and on Kiprianou personally.

During their talks, Papandreu let it be clearly understood that the Greek Government did not wish to involve itself in these two political issues, which are of vital importance and with which Cypriot political circles are now coping. He added, however, that he is prepared to receive President Kiprianou and other Cypriot political leaders in a joint meeting in Athens, on the condition that they first arrive at an agreement in Cyprus.

The Cypriot president briefed the Greek prime minister on DISI's demand that a national unity government be created, eliciting the statement from the Greek Prime minister that it is the Cypriots themselves who must take positions on this issue.

According to political circles in the Greek capital, the Greek prime minister said: "The issue of the creation of a national unity government in Cyprus is your affair and your decision. No matter what you decide, we will respect it. This also applies to the convention of an all-national conference in an effort to forge a joint policy on the Cyprus issue. Once you are agreed, we would have no objections, and we would receive you in Athens."

Authoritative political circles in Nicosia have stressed that President Kiprianou is totally unwilling to proceed on either issue, thereby reserving for himself alone, as he has in the past, all power to deal with the national problem.

According to the same circles, Kiprianou will seek gradually to sideline the Perez de Cuellar document and to gain Papandreu's full support so that he may be allowed to continue to govern and to handle the Cyprus issue with the same mentality and tactics he has used so far.

In the meantime, it is expected that the President Kiprianou, who returned from Athens yesterday, will call political leaders for separate meetings today, after first briefing them on the talks he held with the Greek prime minister.

YILMAZ URGES COOPERATION AGAINST TERRORISM

TA171615 Ankara ANATOLIA in Turkish 1505 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] Ankara, 17 Apr (AA) -- State Minister and Acting Foreign Minister Mesut Yilmaz has said that "the government is closely following the incidents between the United States and Libya." Replying to off-agenda speeches at the Turkish Grand National Assembly, Yilmaz said that "the only way to end terrorism in the world is for countries to effectively cooperate. Only through effective, joint cooperation can terrorism be prevented," he said.

SPD CHIEF ON GOVERNMENT APPROACH TO LIBYAN CRISIS

TA171550 Ankara ANATOLIA in English 1456 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] Ankara, 17-4. (AA) -- Servet Devrinci, assistant secretary general of the SHP [Social Democratic People's Party], accompanied by a group of SHP deputies, today paid a visit to Muhammad 'Adb al-Malik, Ankara People's Bureau's secretary.

During their visit, Istanbul Deputy Huseyn Avni Guler said "We feel obliged to take place near Libya at the U.S.-Libyan war." [sentence as received] Noting that the success of Turkey's peace operation owed a lot to Libya and its leader Al-Qadhafi, Guler said, the Turkish Government's approach towards the U.S.-Libyan conflict is insufficient and the Turkish people should actively support Libya. Secretary 'Adb al-Malik said, Libya will never forget the support extended by Turkey throughout the history.

SECURITY PRECAUTIONS TAKEN AT U.S. BASES

TA171446 Ankara ANATOLIA in English 1435 GMT 17 Apr 86

[Text] Ankara, 17/4 (AA) -- All the necessary measures are taken at the American installations, said the interior minister, Yildirim Akbulut. Attending a reception yesterday on the occasion of the 141st anniversary of the police force, asked by reporters, which measures are taken by Turkey at the American installations and sites, Akbulut said the necessary cautions are taken and the governor offices were warned to this end.

EVREN'S STANCE ON U.S.-TURKISH TIES QUESTIONED

TA140834 (Clandestine) Our Radio in Turkish to Turkey 0200 GMT 14 Apr 86

[Station commentary: "A Subject President Kenan Evren Is Very Sensitive About"]

[Excerpt] Dear listeners: In his recent statements to the press, President Kenan Evren has expressed his sensitivity about Turkey's relations with the United States. The Istanbul daily MILLIYET writes that in his statement, the president strongly denied allegations to the effect that U.S. bases in Turkey, including even the airfield in Mus, will be used by U.S. Rapid Deployment Forces [RDF]. How can such a statement be believed?

As you will recall, in a meeting he held with newspaper proprietors and editors last year, Evren made a statement which he pointed out was not for publication. In that meeting held during the first week of August, Evren told them to be careful in reporting on Turkish-U.S. relations in order not to provide the Turkish Communist Party [TCP] and Our Radio with material to be used for propaganda purposes.

He added that foreign forces would be allowed to use the airbases in Mus, Batman, and other locations for a period of 24-48 hours at most. This is what Evren claims. For our part, as early as 1982 we drew our listeners attention to the fact that the new Mus and Batman airbases were being built for the use of American RDF units. In the wake of Evren's meeting with the newspaper editors last year, we stressed that his statement demonstrated that Turkey would allow its soil to be used by the aggressive RDF units. These aggressive units do not need our bases for more than a day or two. These forces, which will be flown in from their headquarters in the United States, will use these bases for a stopover for supplies and refueling, which will not last more than 24 or 48 hours. This means that the United States will be able to use Turkish soil in an aggression to be carried out against the Persian Gulf countries.

As we have already reported, a new base is being constructed for use by U.S. forces on an area of 12,000 hectares between the villages of Tabanlı and Cukurbag in Mus. An agreement to this effect was signed between Turkey and the United States at the NATO Headquarters in Brussels on 29 November 1982. In fact, NATO was only used as a cover for the agreement, because it was signed with the United States alone and was called an agreement of understanding between the two countries. As then Turkish Defense Minister Haluk Bayulken and Turkish Deputy Chief of the General Staff General Necdet Oztorun were signing the agreement in Brussels, Foreign Minister Ilter Turkmen was paying an official visit to Moscow.

According to the agreement of understanding signed in Brussels, Turkey agreed to extend landing strips in nine military airfields to allow their use by U.S. B-1 and B-52 heavy-bombing aircraft. The construction of two new bases was also undertaken in Mus and Batman for use by the American RDF units. Our radio has already disclosed these facts and projects to the public. A similar incident occurred on 1 November 1982, a few days before the fake referendum was held to approve Evren's constitution. During a talk with two journalists at the Diyarbakir Officers Club, Evren severely criticized them for providing material to be used by Our Radio for propaganda purposes. In light of all these developments, how is it possible to believe that Evren is so sensitive on U.S.-Turkish relations and that he firmly opposes the use of the Mus airbase by U.S. forces. There is no evidence to support this stand; on the contrary, the last 6 years prove that not only was he insensitive about these relations but he even allowed U.S. imperialism to grossly interfere in our national independence.

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

21 April 86

2/6